

REMARKS

UPON

Dr. CLARK'S

Scripture-Doctrine

OF THE

TRINITY.

By the Author of, *Some Considerations concerning the Trinity, and the Ways of managing that Controversy.*

L O N D O N:

Printed by W. B. for HENRY CLEMENTS,
at the Half-Moon in St. Paul's Church-
Yard, MDCCXIV.

REMARKS

UPON

Dr. CLARK'S

Scripture-Doctrine

OF THE

TRINITY.

By the Author of, *Some Considerations concerning the Trinity, and the Manner of Managing that Controversy.*

L O N D O N.

Printed by W. B. for Henry Clements
at the Half-Moon in St. Paul's Church-
yard, MDCCLXIV.

Price One Shilling.

THE PREFACE

If, therefore, I have in any manner



Write, conscious of any such Mistake;
there is one thing I am doubtful
of, viz. Whether he be really of the

PREFACE

Nature supplied the place of the Hu-



*Have nothing to acquaint
the Reader of the fol-
lowing Remarks with,
but that I did, accor-
ding to Dr. Clark's de-*

sure, peruse his whole Book, and Pref. p. 1.
*consider seriously every part of it,
before I passed any Judgment upon
it: But I did not compare the
whole of what he said with other
whole Schemes, for the Reason here-
after given, viz. Because I did not
fully comprehend his whole Scheme.*

The PREFACE.

If, therefore, I have in any particular mistaken his Sense, this must be my excuse to all my Readers, as well as to himself. I am not at present, after a careful perusal of what I have Writ, conscious of any such Mistake; there is one thing only I am doubtful of, viz. Whether he be really of the same Opinion with Mr. Whitton in this respect, that the $\Lambda\gamma\omicron$, or Divine Nature supplied the place of the Human Soul in Christ; if he be not, (as I have supposed he is) I do hereby very readily acknowledge my Error, and beg Pardon for it; and I should be glad he would give me an Opportunity of acknowledging more Errors of the like Kind.

consider seriously every thing I have said before I passed any Judgment upon it: But I did not compare the whole of what he said with other whole Schemes, for the Reason hereafter given, viz. Because I did not fully comprehend his whole Scheme.

REMARKS

A 2



REMARKS

UPON

Dr. CLARK's

Scripture-Doctrine

OF THE

TRINITY.



WHEN I published *Some Considerations concerning the Trinity*, I did not foresee any Occasion I could have to imploy my Thoughts again upon this Subject; being fully perswaded, for the Reasons there alledged, that the established Doctrine of the Church was not capable of farther Explication. But Dr. *Clark* having undertaken to set this matter in a clearer Light, his Character for Learning, Judgment

REMARKS *upon* Dr. Clark's

ment, and cool Reflection gave me just Reason to suspect my former Opinion; and therefore I read over his Book with all the Care and Attention I could, and with a sincere Disposition to be informed: But instead of receiving the Satisfaction I expected, I am now more thoroughly convinced of the Necessity of acquiescing in what is already determined by the Church in relation to this important Article of our Faith; since I do not find that any thing advanced by Dr. *Clark* has opened more of this Mystery to us; and I do perceive many things in his Book plainly favouring such Opinions as have been effectually confuted long before, and which of all other relating to this Doctrine I look upon to be most inconsistent with the first Principles both of natural and revealed Religion.

For this last Reason chiefly it is that I have thought it proper to publish the following Remarks, and have endeavoured at the same time to enforce the Proofs of our common Faith; in order to settle the Minds of those, who by the Authority of a Name, the Appearance of Novelty, and a covert way of Expression, may be induced to embrace such Errors as in their known Dress and Habit wou'd find no Admittance.

I shall not charge Dr. *Clark* with any Opinion which is not expressly owned by him, nor load his avowed Doctrine with
 2 any

any Consequences which do not, according to the best of my Judgment, immediately and directly follow from them: And even those I shall not always look upon to be his. But if I should in any Particular mistake his Sense, I desire he will impute it to my not rightly understanding his Scheme, which, I must profess, after the most diligent Perusal, I do not fully comprehend.

The Doctor, in his Introduction, tell us, *Introduc.*
that *Tritheism, Sabellianism, Arianism,* *P. 27.*
and Socinianism, have, to the great Disparagement of Christianity, puzzled the plain and practical Doctrine of Scripture with endless speculative Disputes. And he assures us, that *the Design of his Book was* *P. 28.*
to shew how these Extremes may be avoided. Now from hence one would be apt to conclude that he was himself entirely orthodox; since these are all the Heresies which the Defenders of the established Faith are, at present, concerned to guard against. But that his Doctrine is different from that of the Church will appear plainly when we come to consider it.

Whoever reads the *Second Part* of Dr. Clark's Book, where the *Sum of his Doctrine* is collected into *methodical Propositions*, will think it very consistent with Charity and Truth to rank him in some *Arian Class*; there being (as I am verily persuaded)

ded) in five and fifty Propositions, but one single Expression which any of those, who now profess themselves *Arians*, would refuse to subscribe to: And it is this.

Prop. 27.
p. 298.

Concerning the Son there are the greatest Things spoken in Scripture, and the highest Titles ascribed to him, even such as include ALL DIVINE POWERS excepting absolute Supremacy and Independency.

All Divine Powers excepting absolute Supremacy is, in the utmost Latitude of the Terms, more than an *Arian* will allow: But this Proposition being supported by a collection of Texts only, several of which are no where explained by Dr. Clark, and are explained by the *Arians* in a Sense agreeing with their Hypothesis, as particularly that famous Text, *John xiv. 30.* where it is said, that Christ *knoweth all things*, we cannot certainly determine what the Doctor's true Meaning is.

P. 379.

But in the *Third Part* of his Book, where he has considered the principal Passages in the Liturgy of the Church of England relating to the Doctrine of the Trinity, there are many Expressions farther removed from *Arianism* than that before mentioned: And therefore, in order to judge more exactly what his true Sentiments upon this Subject are, and wherein his Notions are different from those of his Brethren, who join with him in the use of the same
publick

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

50

publick Forms of speaking; I shall give my Readers a short View of his whole Doctrine together, in its nearest Approach to what we account orthodox.

The Son is *God* in every Sense, in which P. 466.
Divinity can be derived from him which is unbegotten, to him which is begotten.

The Son is *equal* to the Father, in every P. 442.
such Sense as is consistent with these Words in the *Athanasian Creed*, *The Son is of the Father.*

The *Second* and *Third* Persons [of the P. 438.
Trinity] have *always* been with the *First*; and there hath been *no Time*, wherein the *Father* did not act and govern all things (as he now does) by *his Son*, and by *his Spirit*.

And, as the *Second* and *Third* Person are P. 439.
always with the *First*; so are they with him also *every where*: As there has been *no time*, so neither is there *any Place*, where the *Father* does not act and govern all things by *his Son*, and by *his Spirit*.

The *Son* and the *Holy Ghost* are *Almighty*, P. 432.
as *having all Power*; (i. e.) having and exercising the Power of the *Father*.

The *Divinity* of the Son, and of the *Holy Ghost*, is *no other* than what is communicated to them from the *Father*, as from the only self-existent Original; and consequently no Diminution of the *Unity* of God. P. 428.

P. 455.

By *three Persons and one God* cannot be meant one *compound Being*, constituted, or made up of *three Parts*; nor one *Species*, consisting of *three co-ordinate Individuals*; nor one *Person* considered only under *three different Denominations*.

P. 479.

But the consistent and intelligible Meaning of these Words can be no other than this, that there is *one God, the Father Almighty*; and that *with him*, by immediate *Union* with him, and ineffable *Communication* of Being and Power from him, always are *his Son and his Spirit*: So that not in his *own Person* only, but in, and by *his Son and Spirit*, is *his* divine Power, Glory, and Majesty continually and plenarily manifested.

Thus far Dr. Clark's Notions of the Trinity seem to agree with the publick Professions of our Faith. But the main fundamental Difference between him and the learned Writers of our Church, in the way of explaining the Doctrine of the Trinity, is, in short, this.

P. 241,
&c.

Intelligent Being and Person are all along used by him as synonymous Terms; so that, according to his Scheme, the three *divine Persons* must be *three different Beings*, *individually* distinct from each other; and as far as I can collect from his whole Discourse, they must be of a different Nature

P. 102.

ture too: And for that Reason (as I apprehend) it is, that the Word God is not, by him, thought applicable to the Second and Third Person, in the same Sense, as it is to the First.

Whereas the received Opinion of our Church is; that *Father, Son and Holy Ghost are one and the same God, individually the same, of the same Nature, Substance and Perfections*, whatever ineffable Distinctions may be signified by those three personal Characters.

Whether this Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, or the former, be most agreeable to Scripture, is the whole Question between us; and therefore, in answer to Dr. Clark, I shall apply my self chiefly to the Proof of these two Propositions, *viz.*

First, That Father, Son and Holy Ghost cannot be three different Beings.

Secondly, That they are one and the same God; that the Word God, when ascribed to our Saviour, [and to the Holy Ghost] has the same Signification, as when 'tis ascribed to the Father, and includes the same infinite and unbounded Perfections.

Whist.
Vol. iv.
p. 112.

Here the true Difficulty of the Case lies, says Mr. Whiston, in the Dispute between him and the Orthodox: and so it does likewise in our present Controversie with Dr. Clark;

Ibid.

for which Reason I shall dwell the longer upon this Head.

After which I shall make some particular Remarks upon such Passages in the Doctor's Book as have not been considered in the Proof of these two Points, and seem to favour the contrary Doctrine.

I. In the first Place then I shall endeavour to shew, that Dr. Clark's Notion of the Trinity, which makes the three Persons to be three different Beings, cannot be true in any Sense.

If we consider Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as three different Beings, and all of them *Eternal, Omnipresent, Almighty, &c.* the immediate Result of our Thoughts is, that they are *three Gods*. That they are not three *co-ordinate* Gods, the Doctor has not only plainly asserted, but fully proved; and therefore, in that Sense, his Notion of the Trinity is no way liable to the Charge of *Tritheism*. But *three Divine Beings*, vested with *Divine Attributes*, each of which is called God, must needs be conceived as *three Gods*, notwithstanding any *Subordination* of the *Second* and *Third* Being to the *First*; or else we must free the Pagan World from the Absurdity of *Polytheism*, and the Guilt of *Idolatry*; these being generally, if not always, founded upon
a Sub-

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

9

a Subordination of many Deities to the one Supreme.

But if, to preserve the Unity of God, it be affirmed, that the Divinity of the Son P. 428 and of the Holy Ghost, is no other than what is communicated to them from the Father: And that the Power of the Son, P. 333 [so likewise of the Spirit] is itself the Power and Authority of the Father, communicated to, manifested in, and exercised by the Son. And, if all the other Divine Attributes, derived from the Father to the Son and the Spirit, are (as 'tis reasonable from hence to infer) communicated in like manner, so as to be still the very Attributes of the Father: If, as the Power of the Son and Spirit, is itself the Power of the Father; so also the Knowledge, Wisdom, Goodness, &c. of the Son and Spirit, is itself the Knowledge, Wisdom, Goodness, &c. of the Father; then, whatever is said of three Divine Persons, there is indeed (according to Dr. Clark's Philosophy) but one, viz. the Father, and consequently, the Son and Holy Ghost are only different Denominations of the same Being, and not distinct Beings: For, if they have no other Attributes but the Father's, and no other Divinity but his; they can have no other Nature neither, but that of the Father: And then Dr. Clark must be obliged to own, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost

Ghost, are only *three Names* of God; because there is no other *Personal Distinction* allowed of by him, but that of *three Denominations*, or *three Beings*.

P. 243.

What the proper metaphysical Nature, Essence, or Substance of any of the Divine Persons is, I do not inquire, for the same Reason that the Doctor gives, because *the Scripture has no where at all declared it*. But, whether they have all three the *same Nature*, or a *different*, whatever the Nature of any of them be, is necessary to be consider'd, before we can pronounce any thing concerning their *Unity or Distinction*; the *Unity of God* being (as Dr. Clark himself observes upon another Occasion) an *Unity of Nature, or Essence*.

Serm. upon the Being and Attrib. of God, p. 95.

P. 479.

Now it plainly appears both to the Doctor and me, from the Scripture Account of this Matter, that the *same Divine Perfections*, which are ascribed to the Father, and *no other*, are *continually*, and *plenarily manifested*, in, and by, *the Son and Spirit*. And from thence I conclude, that they have all three the *same Divine Nature*; and consequently that they are *one and the same God*: Because we know nothing of the *Nature of God* but by his *Attributes*. If therefore the *Attributes of the Father* may be communicated, the *Nature* may be so too; because the *Nature is* (as Mr. Whiston rightly says) *the Foundation of the Properties*,

Whist. Vol. iv. p. 172.

OR

or Attributes: From whence it plainly follows, that there may be three Persons, who partake of the same Divine *Nature*, as well as they do of the same Divine *Attributes* and *Perfections*; which is the Orthodox Notion of a Trinity.

And, as I cannot conceive the three Divine Persons to be three *Beings*, because that would infer three *Natures*, and consequently three *Gods*; so it seems to me that the Doctor himself has taken away all Distinction of *Being* and *Nature*, by allowing every Person in the Trinity to be *Eternal*; (if he does allow it, which I shall have Occasion to consider hereafter) because whatever is Eternal must enter into our Notion of God. This is so evident to me, that could *Matter* be proved to be eternal, I should then conclude, that it belonged to the Nature of God, tho', at present, I am not capable of such a Thought.

Every thing that is, must be either God himself, or be made by him: there can be no middle Beings between *the Creator* and *the Creature*; and I cannot frame any Notion of an *eternal Creature*; because whatever is eternal, must be likewise (according to the best of my Apprehension) *necessarily existent*: It need not indeed be *self-existent*, for there may be *necessary Emanations* from the *one self-existent Being*; but whatever is in any manner eternally derived from

from the self-existent Being, the *Generation*, *Procession*, or what Name soever we give it, must be *necessary*.

I had not enter'd so far into a metaphysical way of reasoning upon this Subject, but that I take the Doctor's whole Hypothesis, and all the Conclusions built upon it (so far as I am able to collect what his Opinion concerning the Trinity is) to turn upon this one single Notion of *Self-existence*.

And his Argument seems to be this; that because *Self-existence* cannot be communicated, and *Self-existence* is the peculiar Character of the *Father*, therefore the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* cannot be the same God with the *Father*. In answer to which, it may be truly said, that the *Nature* of that Being, who is *self-existent*, may be communicated, tho' the Character of *Self-existence* cannot; which is no more than to say, the Nature of the *Father* may be communicated, tho' the *Paternal Character* and Relation cannot. And therefore the τὸ αὐτὸν ὂν is not fairly render'd the *self-existent Nature*; because the self-existent Nature takes in the whole Nature of him who is self-existent, that is, of *God*.

Ibid.

But after all, Self-existence, as distinguished from *Eternity*, is not properly the *Nature of God*, nor a *primary Attribute of his Essence*, as 'tis called in the same Place; but

but only a *Mode of Subsistence*, which is equally applicable to all the several Attributes of God, as well as to the Divine Nature in general; so that the *Knowledge, Power, Goodness, &c.* of the Father are *self-existent* as well as his Nature; and therefore, by the Doctor's way of reasoning, cannot be communicated, any more than the *self-existent Nature* can.

It may be likewise observed upon this Head, that *self-existent* is only a *negative Term*, which signifies no more than *not made or created, not begotten*; and accordingly these Words $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\eta\eta\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ and $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\eta\eta\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in the Greek Fathers, and *increated, infectus innatus* in the Latin, are every where almost render'd by Dr. Clark *self-existent*: But, should we suppose this Word to have any positive Signification, it must either mean, that God is *Author of his own Existence*, which is absurd; or that he is *necessarily existent*; and then the same thing may be affirmed both of the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*; and consequently *self-existent*, in this Sense, can be no peculiar Character of the *Father*.

But I shall proceed no farther in my Answer to this Argument, tho' it be frequently repeated, and runs thro' the whole Book; because I entirely agree with Dr. Clark in this, that *all Scholastick and Philosophical* Intr. d. p. 26. *Inquiries concerning the Metaphysical Na-*
ture

P. 292.

P. 289,
290.

ture and Substance of each of the three Persons in the ever Blessed Trinity; As also in what particular Metaphysical Manner the Son is begotten of the Father; or the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, ought carefully to be avoided.

II. I come therefore in the next Place to shew, what I cannot but think must be evident to every sincere Reader of Scripture, and which equally concludes against a *Trinity of Beings*, whatever Scheme it be founded upon, that the Word *God* is applicable to the *Son*, and to the *Holy Ghost*, in the same Sense as it is to the *Father*.

And, were it not for Philosophical Reasonings, there could be no manner of doubt of this; there being no one Expression in the whole Bible that is apt to mislead a common Reader in this Matter.

P. 98, 99. Let who will *peruse* and *consider* the *Texts*, produced by Mr. *Whiston*, in his Fourth Volume of what he calls *Primitive Christianity revived*, and he will never find himself disposed from thence to form a wrong Notion of *God*, or to give any of that Honour, which is due to the true God, to *Angels*, *Men*, or *Idols*, because they are sometimes called *Gods*. Nay I will venture to say, that there never was any Christian yet mistaken about any of these Texts: And
never

never was there any Heretick yet, who owned the Divinity of Christ, so hardy as to say, that *Christ* is called *God*, in no other Sense, but that in which the Word *God* or *Gods* is used in some of those Texts produced by Mr. *Whiston*.

Did the *Israelites* worship *Moses*, because the Lord said unto him, *I have made thee* Ex. 7. 1.
a God unto Pharaoh? Or did they look up-

on him as any more than a Man, notwithstanding that Appellation, and all the wonderful Works that were wrought by his Hands? And were not all those *Judges*, Ex. 21. 6.
Rulers, and *Prophets*, of whom it was said Ex. 22. 28.
that *they were Gods*, esteemed as *Men* only while they lived, as well as when they Pf. 82. 1, 6.
were seen to *die like Men*? Was there any Joh. 10.
Danger of Men's worshipping *Idols*, because 34, 35-
they were called *Gods of Silver and Gold*? Or could the Devil himself deceive any Persons into the Worship of him, because he was stiled *the God of this World*? 2. Cor. 4. 4.

The Word *God*, in the plural Number, could never be misapplied by any body who was taught that there is but one God: And when it is applied in the singular Number, to any other Being besides the true God, it is always qualified with *as*, *like*, *instead of*, or some other Particle of the same Signification; or if not, yet the Nature of the Subject necessarily determines us to understand it with the like Qualification; as when

Gen. 3. 5.
Ex. 4. 16,
&c.

Ex. 7. 1. when the *Lord said unto Moses, I have made thee a God unto Pharaoh*, the Meaning of this Expression is the same with that other, *thou shalt be unto him instead of God.*

But it is not only from the Use of the Word *God* in Scripture that we conclude the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* to be truly *God*, the *same God* with the *Father*; but from the *Titles, Perfections* and *Powers* there ascribed to them.

For, if the same Attributes, which distinguish the true and only God from every thing else that is called God, are every where in Scripture applied to the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, in the same manner as they are to the *Father*, we may justly infer from hence, that they are the same God with the *Father*.

And the Inference would hold good, if the Word *God* had never been used in Scripture to signify the Person either of the *Son*, or *Holy Ghost*: for so the *Holy Ghost* is allowed by Dr. *Clark*, and Mr. *Whiston* to be God, tho' the *Word God* (according to them) *no where in Scripture signifies the Person of the Holy Ghost*; upon the Account of those *great things which are spoken of him*, and those *high Titles which are ascribed to him*: And they allow him to be as truly God, and in as high a Sense,

as

Clark,
p. 303.
Whist.
Vol. iv. p.
361.

as they would have done, if the Word God, had sometimes plainly signified the Person of the Holy Ghost.

In the Proof therefore of this Point, I shall confine my self wholly to the Person of the Son; because, if the Son be prov'd to be the same God with the Father, they will easily grant that the *Holy Ghost* is so too.

Now, in proving this Point, I shall premise this Observation of the Doctor's, which I shall not dispute with him; viz. that *P. 296.* the *Scripture* being written as a Rule of Life, neither in this, nor in any other Matter, ever mentions any metaphysical Notions, but only moral Doctrines, and natural Truths, so far as they happen to be connected with Moral; so that the Word *Ibid.* God, when spoken of the Father himself, is never intended in Scripture to express philosophically his abstract metaphysical Attributes; but to raise in us a Notion of his Attributes relative to us, his supreme Dominion, Authority, Power, Justice, Goodness, &c.

This being premised, the Conclusion which immediately follows from hence is, that, if the Son be represented in Scripture as having the same *Attributes relative to* *Ibid.* *us*, and the same *Divine Authority over us*, as the Father hath; we must believe him to be the same God.

C

And

P. 89.
P. 298.

P. 243.

P. 244.

ibid.

And if we carefully peruse all those Texts, which Dr. Clark has collected from p. 84. to p. 131. it is hard to be of any other Opinion. Nay 'tis hard to conceive how he himself can have any other Notion of the Son: Since from these very Texts he is convinced, not only that *the World was made by him*; but that *there are other the greatest things spoken in Scripture concerning him*; and *the highest Titles ascribed to him*; even such as include all Divine Powers, excepting absolute Supremacy and Independency: For, as to the Title of *absolute Supremacy and Independency*, which is here excepted, together with all those equivalent Terms which are by him appropriated to the Person of the *Father*, as that, *he alone is self-existent, underived, unoriginated, independent, made of none, proceeding from none*: He alone is in the HIGHEST, STRICT, and PROPER Sense ABSOLUTELY Supreme over all: He alone is, ABSOLUTELY SPEAKING, *the God of the Universe*: All these Titles, I say, are expressive of *abstract metaphysical Attributes*, which never occur in the sacred Writings, and have no Relation to us; but are introduced into this Controversy concerning the Trinity in order to explain the Distinction of the Father from the other Persons in the Godhead.

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

19

The Notion of God was fully settled, both by *Scripture* and *Reason*, before the Doctrine of a *Trinity* was revealed. And the Discovery of that Doctrine has made no other Change in it, but that we are now taught to apply that Word to *different Persons*; who are all of them *truly God* in the *original* Sense of that Word, by whatever *personal* Characters they may be distinguished from one another.

The *eternal Power and Godhead*, the *uncorruptible God, the Creator*; these are represented in Scripture as *natural* Notions of God, plainly *manifested and understood by the Things that are made*; so that all the *Gentiles*, both *Greeks and Barbarians*, who wanted the Benefit of Divine Revelation, are deemed to have been *without Excuse* who knew not thus much of God; or *knowing* him to be the *eternal and uncorruptible God*, who *created the World*, glorified him not as such, but worshipped and served the Creature more than the Creator. And this is the most *metaphysical* Account of God that is any where given us in Scripture.

The most frequent Titles and Characters by which he is made known to Men in the sacred Writings are these:

Psf. 105. 9. *Acts* 2. 39. The Lord our God.

REMARKS upon Dr. Clark's

Pf. 95. 6. The Lord our Maker.

Job. 7. 20. The Preserver of Men.

Pf. 22. 28. The Governor among the Nations.

Is. 33. 22. The Lord our Judge, our Law-giver, our King.

Pf. 62. 11. The God to whom Power belongeth.

1 Sam. 2. 3. *Dan.* 2. 28. A God of Knowledge; who revealeth Secrets.

Pf. 65. 2. A God that heareth Prayer;

Acts 1. 24. That knoweth the Hearts of all Men;

Ex. 34. 7. That forgiveth Iniquity and Transgression;

Jam. 1. 17. From whom cometh every good and every perfect Gift.

Jer. 9. 24. The Lord which exerciseth loving Kindness, Judgment, and Righteousness in the Earth.

Rom. 2. 6. Who will render to every Man according to his Deeds.

This is the plain Account which the Scriptures give us of God; these are *the relative Attributes* which shew *his Divine Authority over us*; these are the Grounds upon which all our *Worship and Obedience* are founded. And all these things are spoken of God, exclusively of any other Being.

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

21

Deut. 6. 4. The Lord our God is one Lord.

Deut. 4. 39. He is God in Heaven above, and upon the Earth beneath: there is none else.

Rom. 1. This is the *incorruptible God*, the *Creator*, whose *Eternal Power* and *Godhead* was manifest to the Gentiles.

1 Tim. 6. 16. For he only hath *Immortality*.

Is. 44. 24. He is the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the Earth by himself.

Psf. 4. 8. The Lord only maketh us dwell in Safety.

1 Tim. 6. 15. He is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.

Jam. 4. 12. He is the one Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy.

Psf. 72. 18. He only doth wondrous things.

Deut. 3. 24. What God is there in Heaven, or in Earth, that can do according to his Works, and according to his Might?

1 Tim. 1. 17. He is the only wise God.

Is. 41. 23. 26. There is none else that sheweth the former things; there is none that declareth the things which are to come hereafter; there is none that heareth our Words.

1 Kings 8. 39. He, even he only knoweth the Hearts of all the Children of Men.

Is. 45. 21. There is no God else besides him, a just God and a Saviour; there is none besides him.

Luke 5. 21. Who can forgive Sins but God alone?

Deut. 32. 39. This is the Lord, who saith, I, even I, am he; And there is no God with me: I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal; neither is there any that can deliver out of my Hand.

This is the Scripture-language concerning God; this is the Language, both of the Old and of the New Testament; which is frequently repeated, with great Variety of Expression and Application to us Men. From whence it appears, that the God of the *Jews* is likewise the God of the *Christians*; and that the same God, in whom both *Jews* and *Christians* believed upon the first Publication of the Gospel, was afterwards declared to the *Gentiles*, even the God that made the World, and all things therein; and consequently that wherever the Word God is used in the New Testament, it is used in the same Sense that it had in the Old, and signifies a Being vested with all those Characters beforementioned; viz. *Eternal, Almighty, Creator, &c.*

Acts 17.
34.

In

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity. 123

In all those Passages therefore of the New Testament, where mention is made of the *one or only God*; or where the Word *God* is used *absolutely*, without any Title at all annexed; or where the Word *God* is mentioned with some *high Title*, *Epithet*, or *Attribute*; (excepting only the Title of Father, or some other Word that implies a Relation to the Son or Spirit) we are not to understand the Person of the *Father*; but the *divine Nature*, absolutely taken, without any Regard to the *personal* Distinctions of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*: A Being, vested with such *Divine Attributes* and Characters as are before set forth; such a Being as both *Jews* and *Heathens* worshipped, who acknowledged the *Unity* of God without knowing any thing of the *Trinity*. §. 1. p. 1. §. 2. p. 7. §. 3. p. 50.

This is then begging the Question to apply all these Texts to the *Person of the Father*, where *God* is mentioned *absolutely*; &c. because the Question is, whether the same God, who is here mentioned, is not *Son* and *Holy Ghost* as well as *Father*; and whether this Word *God* be not applicable to all the three Persons in the same Sense.

And that the *Son* is the *same God* with the *Father*, is (as we affirm) very evident from all those *Passages of the New Testament*, wherein he is *stiled God*; wherein it is declared, that the *World* was made *by* P. 84. P. 89.

P. 92.

by him; and wherein the other highest Titles, Perfections, and Powers are ascribed to him; because from these Passages it appears plain to us, that the Word God is applied to the Son in the same Sense, as it is in those other Texts, to the Father; and that the Son has the same *Attributes relative to us*, and the same *divine Authority over us*.

For a farther Confirmation of which Point, I have here added another Collection of Texts, in which Christ speaks himself in his own Person, which, taken all together, seem to me to carry in them a stronger Proof of his Divinity, than all the other Texts which are brought to prove it; especially when we consider, that all these things were spoken by the humblest Man that ever lived, who was *meek and lowly of Heart*, in whose Mouth there was no Guile; and that God, whose Stile and Character are here assumed, is a *jealous God*, who will not give any part of his *Honour to another*.

Matthew 7. 22, 23. Many will say to me in that Day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy Name? and in thy Name have cast out Devils? and in thy Name done many wonderful Works?

And

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

25

And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work Iniquity.

Matth. 8. 2, 3. Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.

I will; be thou clean.

31, 32. The Devils besought him, saying, if thou cast us out, suffer us to go into the Herd of Swine:

And he said unto them, go----

9. 2. Son, be of good cheer, thy Sins be forgiven thee.

29. According to your Faith, be it unto you.

10. 6, 7, 8, 14, 15. Go, --- to the lost Sheep of the House of Israel,

And preach, saying, the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.

Heal the Sick, cleanse the Lepers, raise the Dead, cast out Devils.

And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your Words, verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the Land of Sodom and Gomorrah, in the Day of Judgment, than for that City.

16. 18. Behold, I send you forth as Sheep into the midst of Wolves:

And ye shall be brought before Governors and Kings for my Sake, for a Testimony against them and the Gentiles.

37, 38. He that loveth Father or Mother more than me, is not worthy
of

of me : and he that loveth Son or Daughter more than me, is not worthy of me.

And he that taketh not his Cross and followeth after me, is not worthy of me.

Matth. 11. 28. Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

12. 6. I say unto you, that in this Place is one greater than the Temple.

16. 18, 19. --- Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church ; and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.

And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdome of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.

18. 20. Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them.

19. 29. Every one that hath forsaken Houses, or Brethren, or Sisters, or Father, or Mother, or Wife, or Children, or Lands, for my Name's Sake, shall receive an hundred fold; and shall inherit everlasting Life.

20. 32, 33. What will ye that I shall do unto you?

Lord, that our Eyes may be opened.

23. 10. Neither be ye called Masters, for one is your Master, even Christ.

Matth.

Matth. 23. 34. Behold, I send unto you Prophets, and wise Men, and Scribes; and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, and some of them ye shall scourge-----

24. 35. Heaven and Earth shall pass away; but my Words shall not pass away.

28. 19, 20. Go ye, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:

Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the World.

Mark 4. 39. He arose, and rebuked the Wind, and said unto the Sea, Peace, be still,-----

9. 25. ----- Thou dumb and deaf Spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him.

II. 14. --- No Man eat Fruit of thee hereafter for ever.

16. 17, 18. These Signs shall follow them that believe: In my Name they shall cast out Devils, they shall speak with New Tongues.

They shall take up Serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay Hands on the Sick, and they shall recover.

Luke

Luke 6. 46. Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?

7. 14, 15. Young Man, I say unto thee arise:

And he that was dead sat up.----

47. I say unto thee, her Sins, which are many, are forgiven.

10. 19. Behold, I give unto you Power to tread on Serpents and Scorpions, and over all the Power of the Enemy; and nothing shall by any means hurt you.

13. 12. ---Woman, thou art loosed from thine Infirmary.

14. 33. Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all he hath, he cannot be my Disciple.

21. 15. I will give you a Mouth and Wisdom, which all your Adversaries shall not be able to gainsay, or resist.

17, 18. Ye shall be hated of all Men for my Name's Sake.

But there shall not a Hair of your Head perish.

22. 29, 30. I appoint unto you a Kingdom----

That ye may eat and drink at my Table, in my Kingdom, and sit on Thrones, judging the twelve Tribes of Israel.

23. 43.---- To Day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.

John 1. 48. --- Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the Fig-tree, I saw thee.

2. 19. Destroy this Temple, and in three Days I will raise it up.

4. 14. Whosoever drinketh of the Water [that I shall give him, shall never thirst; but the Water that I shall give him, shall be in him a Well of Water, springing up into everlasting Life.

50. Go thy way; thy Son liveth.

5. 19, 21. What things soever he doth, [*the Father,*] these also doth the Son likewise.

As the Father raiseth up the Dead and quickneth them; even so the Son quickneth whom he will.

25, 28, 29. Verily, Verily, I say unto you, the Hour is coming, and now is, when the Dead shall hear the Voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live.

The Hour is coming in the which all that are in the Graves shall hear his Voice,

And shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the Resurrection of Life; and they that have done evil, unto the Resurrection of Damnation.

40. Ye will not come to me that ye might have Life.

John

John 6. 35. I am the Bread of Life; he that cometh to me, shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me, shall never thirst.

40. ---- I will raise him up at the last Day.

63. ---- The Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life.

8. 12. I am the Light of the World; he that followeth me, shall not walk in Darknes; but shall have the Light of Life.

16. If I judge, my Judgment is true: for I am not alone; but I and the Father that sent me.

23. ---- I am from above ---- I am not of this World.

24. ---- If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your Sins.

31, 32, 35, 36. If ye continue in my Word, then are ye my Disciples indeed.

And ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall make you free.

---- The Son abideth ever.

If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.

51. ---- If a Man keep my Saying, he shall never see Death.

56. Your Father Ahraham rejoiced to see my Day; and he saw it, and was glad.

John

John 8. 58. — Before Abraham was, I am.

10. 9. I am the Door: by me if any Man enter in he shall be saved.

14. I am the good Shepherd, and know my Sheep—

15. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father—

16. Other Sheep I have, which are not of this Fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my Voice; and there shall be one Fold, and one Shepherd.

27, 28. My Sheep hear my Voice:

And I give unto them Eternal Life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my Hand.

30. I and my Father are one.

38. Tho' you believe not me, believe the Works: that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him.

11. 25, 26. I am the Resurrection and the Life: he that believeth in me, tho' he were dead, yet shall he live.

And whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall never die.

12. 26. If any Man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my Servant be—

13. 13. Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am.

John

John 14. 1. --- Ye believe in God, believe also in me.

6. --- I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life ---

11. Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me.

13. Whatsoever ye shall ask in my Name, that will I do.

15. If ye love me, keep my Commandments.

18. I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you.

23. --- If a Man love me, he will keep my Words: and my Father will love him; and we will come, and make our Abode with him.

27. Peace I leave with you, my Peace I give unto you: not as the World giveth give I unto you.

15. 5. I am the Vine; ye are the Branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much Fruit: for without me ye can do nothing.

7. If ye abide in me, and my Words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.

9. --- Continue ye in my Love.

12. This is my Commandment, that ye love one another.

16. Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that you should go, and bring forth Fruit, and

and that your Fruit should remain.

John 16. 14, 15. He [*the Spirit of Truth*] shall glorifie me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.

All Things that the Father hath are mine; therefore said I that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.

33. These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace; in the World ye shall have Tribulation, but be of good chear, I have overcome the World.

17. 10. All mine are thine [*speaking to the Father*] and thine are mine, and I am glorified in them.

18. 36. --- My Kingdom is not of this World.

37. Every one that is of the Truth heareth my voice.

21. 16. --- Feed my Sheep.

22. --- If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me.

Acts 9. 4, 5, 6. He fell to the Earth, and heard a Voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?

Who art thou, Lord? ----- I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.

Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?
---- Arise, and go into the City, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.

REMARKS upon Dr. Clark's

Acts 9. 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17. To him [*Ananias*] said the Lord in a Vision, *Ananias*, --- Behold, I am here, Lord. ---

Arise, --- and inquire for one called Saul : For behold he prayeth.

And hath seen in a Vision, a Man named *Ananias*. ---

Lord, I have heard by many of this Man, how much Evil he hath done to the Saints at Jerusalem. ---

Go thy way, for he is a chosen Vessel unto me to bear my Name before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the Children of Israel.

For I will shew him how great things he must suffer for my Name's sake.

--- Brother Saul, the Lord (even Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way) hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost.

18. 9, 10. Then spake the Lord to Paul, in the Night by a Vision ; be not afraid, but speak. ---

For I am with thee, and no Man shall set on thee to hurt thee : for I have much People in this City.

22. 17, 18. --- I was in a Trance. And saw him saying unto me, make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem : For they will not receive thy Testimony concerning me.

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

35

Acts 22. 21. --- Depart, for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles.

Rev. 1. 11. I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last.

17. --- Fear not ; I am the first and the last.

18. I am he that liveth and was dead ; and behold I am alive for evermore, and have the Keys of Hell and of Death.

2. 7. --- To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Tree of Life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God.

10. --- Be thou faithful unto Death, and I will give thee a Crown of Life.

23. --- All the Churches shall know, that I am he which searcheth the Reins and Hearts : And I will give unto every one of you according to your Works.

3. 19. As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten : Be zealous therefore and repent.

22. 16. I Jesus have sent mine Angel to testify unto you these things in the Churches.

Are not these Expressions of our Saviour Wh. Vol. *Indications of the Omnipotent God him-* iv. p. 177. *self ?* God is pleased sometimes, in condescension to our Weakness, to speak in the Style of Man ; but he suffereth not any

D 2

of

of his Creatures, how perfect soever, to usurp the Style of God, or to appear in his Character and Attributes. Neither is such Language as this necessary for our Capacities as the other is ; but on the contrary, puzzles and confounds us, and renders the Doctrine delivered in it harder to be understood.

The Son of God, tho' God himself, must appear as Man, and speak as Man, because he could not otherwise reveal himself to Men ; but had Christ been Man only, or some other Creature, no reason could be assigned why he should take upon him to be God. And had Christ thus shewn himself to the World, with all the same divine Characters which the Scripture ascribes to him, but without the Relation of *Son* ; we must then have concluded, that the *God-head dwelt in him truly and fully*, without supposing, that the *God* who was thus *manifest in the Flesh*, was any other God than he that was *manifested* by all the other things that were seen.

Col. 2. 9. 1 Tim. 3. 16. Rom. 1. 19, 20.

But after all, notwithstanding Christ is called *God*, and so many *great Things are spoken of him*, and so many *high Titles ascribed to him* ; were there no Instances of *Worship* and *Adoration* paid to him, all our Notions concerning the Trinity might be look'd upon as Matters of Speculation only, in which our Practice being not at all concerned,

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

37

cerned, we might safely differ from one another.

Had we the *Example of Scripture*, and P. 469.
the *Custom of the primitive Church*, to
warrant us in directing all our Prayers
uniformly to the Person of the Father, in
the Name, and through the Mediation of
the Son; by the Assistance, and under the
Direction and Influence of the Holy Spi-
rit: Were it certain, according to Origen,
in his Book concerning Prayer, quoted by
Dr. Clark, in order to shew the general P. 355.
Notion and Practice of the Church in his
Time; that all Prayers ought to be offered to
God the Father only; and not directly to
the Son, or the Spirit, but by or through
them: Were it likewise most proper that
all our Praises or Doxologies should be ex- P. 416.
pressed according to this Form, viz. *Glory*
be to God, [or to the Father] with, or
by, [through the Mediation of] his Son
Jesus Christ our Lord, in [under the Gui-
dance, and by the Assistance of] the Holy
Ghost: And had the Forms of Baptism
and Blessing used in Scripture, been deli-
vered in the like Terms: Had this, I say,
been the constant Language of Scripture
and Antiquity; there would then have been
no ground at all for a direct Worship either
of Son or Holy Ghost; and consequently,
we should have been in no danger of con-
founding the Persons of the Trinity, or of
D 3 ascribing

ascribing the Glory due to the supreme God to any other.

P. 367,
117.

But Dr. Clark allows, that the Son, before his Incarnation, had all divine Honours given him, tho' the Worship was not paid him in his own Person, but as he was the [Shecinah, or] Habitation of the Glory of the Father: That after his Exaltation to his mediatorial Kingdom, he was invested with distinct Worship in his own Person, and received Prayers and Thanksgivings from his Church: And that this Honour which the Scripture directs to be paid to Christ, was upon account of his Authority, Power, Dominion, and sitting on the Throne of God his Father, as our Law-giver, our King, our Judge and our God.

Prim.
Christ.
v. 4.

p. 85.

p. 324.

It is likewise granted by Mr. Whiston, who seems to have lower Notions of the Son and Holy Ghost than Dr. Clark hath, that Jesus Christ is truly God and Lord; and that divine Honour and Worship is due to him, and to be paid, not only by obeying him as our Lord, by baptizing into his Name, by wishing Grace and Peace from him, and by Doxologies; but by proper Adoration, by direct and distinct Invocation, and Thanksgiving to him also.

If this then be allowed, that Christ is to be directly worshipped with any divine Honour

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

39

Honour or Worship whatsoever, I must conclude from hence, that he is *the one supreme God*; because there is no kind or degree of Worship to be paid to any other.

Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, is the first Principle, both of *natural* and *revealed Religion*; Thus it is written, both in the *Old* and *New Testament*. This was the constant Doctrine of *Moses* and the *Prophets*, *Christ* and his *Apostles*; and there is not the least Exception to this general Rule to be found throughout the Scriptures.

There *may be*, no doubt (as our *Reason* plainly tells us) a great variety of glorious Beings between God and Man; *whether they be Thrones or Dominions, or Principalities or Powers*, or by what other Names soever they are named. There are likewise (as the Scripture assures us) *Angels*, and *Arch-Angels*, and a multitude of *the heavenly Host*, which *excel in Strength*, and *are all ministring Spirits*, sent forth by God to do his pleasure.

But whatever Powers or Perfections any of these Beings may have, we are not suffered to make any Application to them, or to pay any sort or degree of Worship to them. Nay, tho' *Angels* are represented in Scripture as being imployed by God in the *conduct of Men*; as concerned for the *Repentance of Sinners*, and *ministring to*

D 4

them

Luk. 4. 8.

Col. 1. 16.

Luk. 2. 13.

Pf. 103.

20.

Heb. 1.

14.

Pf. 103.

21.

Pf. 91. 11.

Luk. 15.

10.

Heb. 1.

14.

Col. 2. 18.

Jud. 13.

16.

Rev. 22.

8. 9.

them who shall be Heirs of Salvation, yet are we expressly forbid to *Worship Angels*. And even they themselves, when by God's Appointment they have *appeared* unto Men, have refused to receive that Honour from them, which Men commonly pay to one another.

And the reason of this is plain ; because we are acquainted with all the Powers and Capacities of human Nature ; we know what Relation we stand in to one another, and what Addresses and Applications are proper to be made according to the different Degrees and Conditions of Men : upon which account we are in no great danger of ascribing more to Man than belongs to him, or of expecting more from him than he can do. But as to all other Beings, which are, or are supposed to be, more perfect than Man, we are ignorant of their Nature, we cannot tell the extent either of their Knowledge or Power, and we know nothing at all of their Intercourse with us : And consequently we are not able to judge *what Honour* is due to them, or what Application is proper ; *when* our Addresses are accepted, or *how* they can be answered. And therefore, till we are fully instructed in all these things, we ought never to *worship* any other Being but *God only*, in any Instance whatsoever ; because otherwise we may give Honour where

where Honour is not due; or we may apply wrong, and to no purpose.

And this I take to be the proper Notion of *Idolatry*, to give more Honour to any kind of Being in a serious and *solemn* Manner than we know, and are sure is due to it. V. P. 352.

Thus every Act of what is called *civil Respect*, with regard to *Men*, when paid to *inanimate Creatures*, is *Idolatry*; because it supposes the like Perfections residing in them, as belong only to *intelligent Creatures*, which is *manifestly false*.

And all Worship, Address, and Application, either to *Men*, or to any *other intelligent* Beings, when *absent*, which would be proper, and perhaps due to them when *present* (unless positively forbid by God) is likewise *Idolatry*; because we cannot do this without ascribing greater Perfections to *intelligent Creatures*, than we have any ground or warrant to believe belongs to them; which *may be* therefore *false*, and consequently the Worship founded upon such Opinion utterly *improper*.

Whatever *Knowledge* the Being I Worship be really indued with, if it fall short of *Omniscience*, I may pray, and not be heard: And if *all Power* do not belong to him, he may hear my Petitions and not be able to grant them: And if I am not truly informed how far both his Know-
ledge

p. 368.

ledge and his Power reach ; however great and extensive they be, I may often apply wrong. So that should we suppose that *Christ*, as *God*, was ignorant of *the Day of Judgment* ; there may be likewise many other things which he is ignorant of, as well as this ; and we, not knowing which they are, cannot justify our making a direct Application to him for any thing. And if no worship was to be paid to him upon Earth, (as Dr. *Clark* insinuates) how can we suppose him a more proper Object of Worship in Heaven, when the Manifestations of his Divinity are less known to us than when he *dwelt* among us *in the Flesh* ; when he is to be worshipped in his *human Nature* ; and when we are more incapable of conceiving how in his human Nature he can at this distance hear our Prayers, and relieve our Wants ?

The plain natural Conclusion of Reason then is ; that every act of *Worship*, *Honour*, or *Respect* which is paid by *Man*, to any *other Being* besides *Man*, necessarily implies that Being to be *God*, *the one supreme God* : Because, without that Supposition, the Worshipper must act absurdly and improperly, and either Worship he knows not what, or exalt a Creature into the place of the Creator. Every Prayer that is put up to such a Being, supposes him *Omniscient* and *Almighty* ; and we cannot bow
down

down to him, or kneel before him, without acknowledging his *Omnipresence*.

'Tis true indeed, God might, if he pleased, command us to worship some other Beings below him ; But then it must be supposed that he would at the same time reveal to us the Nature and Perfections of those Beings, and acquaint us with the manner and degree of Worship due to them. We ought certainly to know what share they have under him in the Government and Direction of our Affairs; which way our Addresses may be communicated to them ; and what Assurance we can have of their Being received, and answered. And in short 'tis absolutely necessary that the exact Bounds both of their *Divinity* and our *Adoration*, should be particularly set out and described to us, or else 'tis manifest, for the Reasons beforegiven, that the Honour we pay may be often times improper, and in many Instances false. But it does not appear from Scripture that God hath set up any of his Creatures to be worshipped by us, there being no mention or intimation in all the sacred Writings of any *inferior Deity*, any *created God*, or *God by Appointment* : Nor is there the least Ground from thence for any such Distinctions as *primary* and *secondary* Worship, *Latria* and *Doulia*, *inferior* Honour, *supreme* Honour, and *absolutely supreme* Honour. P. 352.

On

On the contrary, God hath forbid us to pay the least and most inferiour degree of Respect to the most glorious of all those Creatures that are known to us ; even when they are *present* with us, and come to execute a divine Commission ; in order by this Means to prevent our paying some higher and more improper degree of Worship to them when *absent*.

Supposing therefore Christ to be God, and not the *one supreme God*, in what manner must we worship him ; and in what respects will the Worship paid to him differ from that we pay to the one supreme God ?

P. 352.

Ib.

Honour or Worship (says Dr. Clark) is nothing else but a solemn acknowledging those Attributes to belong to a Being which are indeed his peculiar Properties. From whence he infers, that the Person of the Father, being alone self-existent, independent, unoriginated and absolutely supreme, can alone be honoured as self-existent, independent, unoriginated and absolutely supreme. But these are metaphysical Attributes which we never meet with in Scripture, and which are never made use of by Men in their Addresses to God : If therefore all the other divine Attributes relative to us, which are indeed the peculiar Properties of the one supreme God, such as Creator and Governor of the World, Almighty,

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

45

mighty, Omniscient, Author of every good Gift, &c. If all these Attributes, I say, must be acknowledged to belong to Christ; it immediately follows from the Rule laid down by Dr. Clark, that Christ is to be honoured and worshipped as the one supreme God, whatever becomes of those personal Distinctions, of unoriginated, and derived, absolutely supreme, and supreme.

Nay, farther, could it be supposed, that Christ was God of this System only, and not God of the Universe (which I am apt to suspect is Mr. Whiston's Opinion) it would be all one to us when we consider God not metaphysically, but with relation to our selves, and as the object of human Worship: For if he be our Maker, our King and our Judge; if he knoweth all our Thoughts, can answer all our Prayers; bestow all manner of Gifts and Blessings; and reward and punish us, both now and hereafter, to what degree he pleaseth; 'tis the same thing with regard to us, as if his Knowledge, Power, and other Attributes, were infinite, and extended to the whole compass of Being: The same Worship is to be paid him as to the God over all, the absolute supreme God of the universe, excepting only the use of these and the like Expressions. For as to all other Attributes, it is impossible to distinguish between them; because 'tis impossible to conceive any Power, Knowledge,

ledge, &c. greater than what was employed in the Creation and Government of this System. A Being who made this System, must be conceived by us as capable of making innumerable others; and from a Being who knows the Heart of Man, and every thing that passes in this World, nothing else can be supposed to be hid.

wh. Vol.
iv. p. 85.
P. 172.

To those who own *Jesus Christ to be truly God and Lord*, and yet affirm he is a *Being far inferior to his Father in Nature, Attributes and Perfections*; it may be farther answer'd. How does it consist with our Notion of *the one supreme God*, that he should make a Being, in order to make the rest of the World, by his Help and Assistance: Or that he should set up another inferior object of Worship, when he allows us to address our selves upon all Occasions immediately to himself, and he is able to do more abundantly for us than any other Being, tho' never so perfect.

These are all philosophical and precarious Notions, set up for the maintenance of arbitrary Hypotheses, contrary to the just and most obvious Reasonings of *Nature*, and the simplicity of *divine Revelation*. *God and Man* are the only Beings with whom we have any immediate Intercourse: The only Beings whose Assistance we know to be needful to us, or from whom our Reason tells us any Good or Evil is to be expected.

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

47

expected. As to all other Beings, (whatever Discoveries Revelation hath made to us concerning them) how great their Power and Influence with regard to us is, and in what manner exercised, is still known to God only; and to him therefore we must apply to direct, and restrain them, as he seeth fit.

Christ therefore must be allowed to be *truly God, and truly Man*, or only *true Man*: and considered as *Man* only, I think him as proper an object of Worship as any other the most perfect Being which the *Arians* dream of. For, if we suppose the human Soul of Christ to have existed before the World; (and there seems to me to be great reason to believe it did, many Texts of Scripture being easily explained upon this Hypothesis, which 'tis difficult to account for any other way) supposing, I say, this *Pre-existence* of the Soul of Christ, it may easily be conceived to have been of a more excellent Nature than the *Angels*; since Man, who had a Soul join'd to a Body made out of the *Dust of the Earth*, is said to have been *made but little* Pf. 8. 5. *lower than the Angels*; and the Saints, after the *Resurrection*, will be *equal to* Luk. 20. v. 36. *them*. We have no distinct Notion of any Perfections between those which belong to *God*, and those which he hath imparted to *Man*; and therefore 'tis very possible that
a hu-

a *human Soul* might be so form'd as to be more perfect than any *Angel*, and by the extraordinary Communications of God to it, might do all that the *Arians* attribute to the *divine Nature* of Christ, and be as capable an *object of Worship*.

Phil. 2. 10.
Rev. 5.
11, 12.

'Tis certain likewise from Scripture, that the *Angels* do now worship *Christ* in his *human Nature*: And they may lawfully do it, because they live in his Presence, and know him as we know our Princes and Governors: And so shall we know him, and so shall we worship him after the Resurrection. But we cannot now worship him as *Man* only, without considering him as *God* also, as being in a personal Union with the Godhead: Because we cannot conceive the human Nature, in it self, so exalted as to be capable of discerning the secret Thoughts of all Hearts, of hearing and receiving all the Prayers, Praises and Thanksgivings of all the Servants of Christ over the face of the whole Earth, of distributing to the necessity of all Saints, and of punishing all the wicked Devices and Works of such as are Enemies to the Son of God and his Gospel: This, I say, cannot be conceived by us, because 'tis raising a *Creature* into the State and Condition of the *Creator*, and communicating to another Being those *divine* Attributes which are inseparable from the Nature of *the one God*,

God, and necessarily included in the Notion of it.

But even this may all be believed of *Man*, as well as of any such *divine Creature* as the *Arians* have framed to themselves: But should we say, that the World was created by a *Man*, and that all those other high Titles ascribed to Christ in Scripture, belong'd to him as meer *Man*, tho' a more perfect *Man* than any of his Brethren; and that all the Honour and Worship that was paid him, center'd in his *human Nature*; this would appear so shocking, even to the *Arians*, that they could not bear it; and yet I dare affirm, that this Notion is as defensible as theirs. And I could as willingly worship Christ as *Man only*, as I could worship any other intelligent Creature, how glorious or perfect soever; because I am sure that while he was upon Earth, and appeared only as *Man*, so many of the divine Attributes shewed forth themselves in him, that I can easily conceive a fuller Communication of *Divinity* to him now in Heaven; there being none of the *divine Attributes* but what may as well be communicated to the *Soul of Man*, as to any other created *Mind* or *Spirit*.

If therefore the only reason of worshipping Christ be, that the *Attributes of the Father*, his *divine Power*, *Dominion*, *Dignity*, *Authority*, and other *Attributes*,

E

[not

[not his Nature or Essence] are communicated to him : And if all Prayers and Praises ought primarily or ultimately to be directed to the Person of the Father ; what is this but a Socinian or Sabellian Notion of worshipping the Father, in and by the Son ; there being no other Person (according to Dr. Clark) to whom the Attributes communicated to, manifested in, and exercised by the Son, can belong, but the Father ? And if this be allowed ; then there is no occasion to multiply either Natures, or Persons ; but Christ may be esteemed as meer Man, exercising the Power of God, communicated to him after an ineffable and incomprehensible Manner.

P. 332.

P. 313.

P. 442.

But if the Manifestation of divine Power in Christ be the sole ground of worshipping him, then it may be fairly asked, Why were not Moses, and all the Prophets, Apostles, and other Messengers of God, worshipped also in proportion to the degrees of Power manifested in, or exercised by them ? And why were not those who heard their Words, and saw their Miracles, allowed to pay any the least degree of Worship to them more than to other Men ?

P. 477.

If it be said, that the reason why the Son and Spirit are to be worshipped, and no other Being or Person which exercises the Power of the Father, is, Because he
[son] 2 [I manifested

manifests his Glory in and by them plenarily and without measure. To this it may be objected, how shall we then be able to distinguish between the *Father* and the *Son*, when all that we know of either is by what is manifested of them? We know nothing at all of the proper metaphysical Nature, Essence or Substance of any of the divine Persons; but where we behold a plenary Manifestation of divine Glory, there we must conclude is the one supreme God: And the *Father* cannot discover more of himself than he does by such a Manifestation.

P. 243.

It was the constant Doctrine of the ancient Fathers, that the God which appeared to Men, and conversed with them in the old Testament, was the *Son* or *Word*, who was afterwards made *Flesh*. It was the *Son* who talk'd with *Adam* in Paradise; who appeared in divers Manners to the Patriarchs, to *Moses* and to *Joshua*, and conversed with them face to face, and who spake to the Prophets. It was the *Son* which judged Men from the beginning; who punished the World with a Flood, who destroyed the Tower of *Babel*, and rained Fire and Brimstone upon *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*. It was *Christ* who conducted the Children of *Israel* through the Wilderness; who gave them their Law, and made a Covenant with them, which they and their

P. 102.

or.

Children were to keep till he came again in the Flesh.

And the same Christ, who in divers Manners appeared to the Fathers, is always represented in the old Testament as speaking in the same Style, clothed with the same Attributes, and worshipped with the same Worship, as the God whom we now call God the *Father*. He is there styled *the one or only God*; he is called God *absolutely*, by way of *Eminence and Supremacy*; and all the *high Titles, Epithets and Attributes* are there ascribed to the Son, which are said to be *generally, if not always, by way of supreme Eminency, ascribed to the Person of the Father only in the new Testament*.

P. 50.

This was likewise the unanimous Opinion of the first Christians. And what other Inference can we draw from hence, but that Christ is *the one supreme God*; the *same God* with the Father; and that we *Christians* are to honour the Son as the *Jews* honoured him?

To avoid this Conclusion, 'tis urged by Dr. Clark, and Mr. Whiston, who both of them readily acknowledge the truth of the Premises, that Christ, *the Word, and Son of God, did, in the ancient Times, personate the supreme God, and act wholly in his Name*; so that whenever he appeared or spoke, he appeared and spoke

Wh. Vol.
iv. p. 228.

in

in the * Name and Person of the Father, and consequently, whatever Worship was then paid him, tho' directed to him in his own Person, was really paid to the Person of the Father.

This, it must be owned, was a Notion that some of the Fathers had; but they did not argue from it the same way that our modern Writers concerning the Trinity do: On the contrary, they proved from hence, that Christ was truly God, the same God, tho' not the same Person, with the Father; because he could not otherwise have represented the Father.

And thus we must conclude, whether Christ, before his Incarnation, spake and acted in his own Person, or in the Person of the Father: For, how is it possible for us to imagine, that Adam should not know the God that made him; or that he should worship any other but the true and only God.

E 3

the

* He was that Person in whom the Name of God was [viz. Jehovah, or I am] and by whom God always speaks, p. 99, 105. This Notion of Dr. Clark's is, (as he tells us) founded upon Exod. 23. 21. where it is said, my Name is in him. But if this be meant of Christ, who is it that speaks these Words, Behold I send an Angel before Ex. 23. thee, to keep thee in the way. — Beware of him, and y. 20, obey his Voice, for my Name is in him? If it were God 21. the Father, then God did not always speak by his Son in the Old Testament. If these be the Words of Christ, then the Angel there sent by him was the Person in whom the Name of God was; and the God whose Name was in him was Christ [viz. Jehovah, or I am.]

the supreme God of the World, created just before him? Or, that all the ancient Patriarchs, that *Moses*, *Joshua*, and all the Prophets, and, in general, that the whole *Jewish* Nation, with all their Fathers, from the Creation of the World, to whom God had at divers Times, and in divers Manners, revealed himself, should be mistaken in their Notions of God; and that God himself should lead Mankind into this Mistake, by allowing *the Son* to take upon him the Style and Character, and to accept the Honour and Worship that belonged to the Father only? These are shocking Notions, no ways reconcileable either to Reason, or Scripture; no ways consistent with the Nature of God, or of divine Revelation.

P. 477.

Should we say with Dr. Clark, that the *Jewish* Sense of the word God was the same with the *Sabellian*; no stronger Argument could be brought for the Confirmation of that Heresie: For thus may a *Sabellian* defend his Doctrine. When the *Jews* worshipped the Son of God, who appeared, and spake to them in times past as God; they had no Notion of any other God but the one supreme God, or (as Dr. Clark says) *God the Father*; why may not *Christians* then worship the same *Person*, when manifest in the Flesh, with the same Opinion of him that the *Jews* had? If Christ appeared then only as [the She-

P. 367.

cinah,

cinah, or] Habitation of the Glory of the Father; why might he not appear so in the Flesh too, in whom the Scripture tells us, *All the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily*? If he only personated the supreme God, and acted in his Name in the old Testament; why might he not appear and act under the same Character in the new? Were not as many Signs and Wonders wrought by him, while he *dwelt* among the Jews in the Flesh, as while he remained with their Fore-fathers in the Wilderness, and conversed with them out of the Cloud, and out of the Fire? And did he not in the Flesh give them and all Mankind a more perfect Law, and establish a better Covenant with them, than he did in Horeb?

There is no true satisfactory answer to be given to this by any one who denies that Christ is the same God with the Father. For 'tis certainly a much safer, and a more rational Practice, and (as Dr. Clark also, and Mr. Whiston must allow) better warranted by the Example of the Jews, to worship the Father, in and by Christ appearing to us in the Flesh, than to worship any other Being of inferior Attributes and Perfections; as every Being must be, who is another Being distinct from God the Father.

But the truth of this whole Matter, according to the orthodox Doctrine, is this. When Christ appeared to the Fathers in former Ages; he appeared not in the Person either of the *Son*, or of the *Father*: But as *God* absolutely, as the *Almighty Creator of the World*; as the *God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, and the *God of his People Israel*. And thus did the ancient Patriarchs and their Posterity worship him, as the *everlasting God, the God of Heaven*, and, in a more peculiar manner, *their God*, *their King*, and *their Law-giver*, without any regard to those personal Distinctions of *Father and Son*, (and, as far as we can judge from Scripture) without any knowledge of them.

Neither indeed was there any occasion given them to apply the word *God* to different *Persons*; because none of those *personal Characters, Offices and Relations*, by which *Father, Son and Holy Ghost* are now distinguished from one another in the new Testament, were revealed in the old; at least none so plainly as to be understood by the People. But from what is now discovered to us, we collect, that it was the *Son*, and not the *Father*, who appeared as *God* in the ancient Times, and was worshipped as the one supreme God, by the *Jewish Nation*. But then from the Style he used, the Titles that were ascribed to him, and the Worship that

that was paid him, we infer likewise, that he must be the same God with the Father; because all the same divine Attributes which which are contain'd in our Notion of God, consider'd without the distinction of Persons; all the divine Attributes which imply any Relation to us, or any Authority over us, are in the Writings of the old Testament applied to the Son; and all the same divine Worship which is due to God consider'd thus absolutely was then paid to the Son: And therefore we may now *speak the same things* of Christ, *ascribe the same Titles* to him, and worship him with the same *Worship* as the *Jews* did of old; adding only those personal Characters and Distinctions which are revealed to us, and were not known to them,

I cannot therefore but conclude from the *Name* of God, which is given to Christ in Scripture; from the divine *Attributes and Characters* there ascribed to him; and from the *Worship* which is paid him; that he must be the true God, the same God with the Father.

And I am farther confirmed in this Opinion by considering the Conduct of the *Son of God*, while he conversed upon Earth as Man; and the Conduct of the *Spirit of God*, in teaching *the things concerning him in all the Scriptures*: For the more likelihood there was of mistaking Christ for the true

P. 287.

P. 302.

true God, the more Reason there is to suppose, that he who *from the beginning had been the Word, or the revealer of the Will of the Father to the World*: And that the *Holy Spirit*, who was *Inspirer and Director of the Prophets and Apostles*, should in their Intercourse with Mankind have ministred no just occasion for such a Mistake.

But our Saviour, 'tis plain, after *he was made Flesh, and dwelt among us*, did nothing to prevent his being thought God. On the contrary, he often spake in the Style of God; (as evidently appears from the many Passages of Scripture, which I have collected together under this Head,) he suffered himself to be reviled, and evil intreated by his Enemies, for what they accounted *Blasphemy in making himself * God*; and he allowed his Disciples to worship him in such a manner as they were afterwards satisfied no other Being but God ought to be worshipped; and with such Honour as they expressly forbid others to pay to any Being besides God.

Joh. 10.
33.

Neither has the Spirit, in the writings of the new Testament, expounded any of those things

* 'Tis plain, that the word God is here taken absolutely, and yet it cannot mean the Father, because the Jews knew very well that Christ did not pretend to be the Father, but the Son of God; and therefore when God, in other Places, is taken absolutely, it cannot be confined to the Person of the Father.

things which were said or done by our Saviour and his Apostles, or by any of the *Jews*, whether Disciples or Unbelievers, which seem to establish the Divinity of our Saviour, in any such Sense as might dispose us to believe him to be any other Being but the true God. When Christ was accused of Blasphemy for pretending to such Characters and Powers as belonged to God alone, no other Answers are given Mar. 2. 9. but what plainly allow the Charge, if he Mar. 14. 64. were not truly God: When 'tis related of John 10. 33. *Thomas*, that he thus addressed himself to Christ, *My Lord, and my God*, the Address John 20. 28. was accepted without any reproof, by our Saviour, and without any Explication by the Evangelists; and yet there is no Instance in Scripture, that Mr. *Whiston* can produce, where the word God, when thus used in the second Person, is capable of being applied to any other Being but the true and only God. So when 'tis said of the Disciples, that they worshipped Christ both before and after his Resurrection, and particularly just as he was ascending up into Heaven; we have not the least Intimation given us by any of the holy Penmen, who mention these Facts, that this Worship did in any manner differ from the Worship paid to God the Father.

Nay, farther, it is in the Writings of the new Testament, that the Holy Ghost hath

hath taught us, that the God who appeared in times past as the most high God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, and the God of *Israel*, was *Christ* the Son of God; and even in those very Places where this Doctrine is delivered, he is styled God *absolutely* in the same manner as he was in the old Testament; notwithstanding the plain Revelations there lately made of the distinction between Father and Son, as
 1 Cor. 10. particularly where it is said, *with many of*
 5. *them God was not well pleased, for they were overthrown in the Wilderness.* The
 y. 4. God here meant is *Christ*, who in the Verse before is called *the spiritual Rock which followed the Children of Israel* in their Passage through the Wilderness, and whom we are afterwards admonished not to tempt,
 y. 9. *as some of the Israelites tempted, and were destroyed of Serpents,*

So likewise when it is thus written in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*;

Heb. 6. 13, 14. When God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself;

Saying, surely blessing, I will bless thee; and multiplying, I will multiply thee.

Heb. 11. 3, 4, 7. The Worlds were framed by the Word of God.---

By Faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent Sacrifice than Cain.---

Cain. ----- God testifying of his Gifts. ---
 Noah being warned of God. ---
 &c.

In all these Places where the word *God* is mentioned *absolutely*, *Christ* is meant; because whatever is here said of *God*, it's owned belongs to *Christ* in the *old Testament*.

But that which sets this matter past dispute is the plain Declaration of our Saviour, *that all Men should honour the Son, even as they Honour the Father*; and the concurrent Testimony of the *Spirit*, who directed the Evangelist to write this without suggesting any Distinction or Limitation thereupon. This Text is brought by Mr. *Whiston* as a proof of the *supereminent and divine Honour and Worship due to the Son of God*; and this is one of the *Passages of the new Testament wherein* (according to Dr. *Clark*) is set forth the *Honour and Worship which ought to be paid him*. This is then, by the Confession of all Parties, a Rule laid down for the worship of *Christ*; in what sense then are we to understand it?

The meaning of this Passage, Dr. *Clark* says, is this; that *as the Jews*, to whom our Saviour directs his Discourse in this place, *honoured God the Father, so they should also for the future honour the Son of God*. But this Explication does not at all

all help us to understand what kind or degree of Honour we are to pay him, which is the only Question we are concerned to have resolved.

Vol. iv.
P. 72.

Mr. *Whiston* allows, that our Saviour is to be *directly worshipped and invocated* but with *inferior Titles and Appellations*, than those we ascribe to the Father; and this is likewise granted by the Orthodox. But then they assert, that this is the only difference in the Worship we are commanded to pay to the Father and the Son: For as we read 1 Cor. 15. 27. where 'tis said, * *He [the Father] hath put all things under his Feet; [Christ's] 'tis manifest that he is excepted that did put all things under him*: So it is written, that *ye shall honour the Son as ye honour the Father*: 'Tis manifest that all such *Titles and Appellations* which belong to God as Father of Jesus Christ, are excepted out of this Rule, and cannot be applied to the Son, and make part of the Honour that we are to give him. But then 'tis manifest, that no other are excepted; and consequently the

P. 88.

* So in like manner (says Dr. Clark) when 'tis said that Christ is God over all, and Lord over all, 'tis manifest that he must needs be excepted, by Communication of whose divine Power and supreme Authority Christ is God or Lord over all: And there can be no doubt made of this, that Christ is not God or Lord over the Father: But if he be God and Lord over all besides, he must needs be the same God with the Father.

the meaning of the Rule must be, that whatever Honour you gave to God absolutely, before this distinction of *Father and Son* was made known to you, you shall now give to him who is revealed, to be the *Son of God*.

And that no other Exception but that before-mentioned is to be made, is evident from the very nature of the Subject. For should we suppose with the *Arians*, that the Knowledge, Power, Authority, and other Attributes of the Son, are not infinite or equal to the like Perfections of the supreme God the Father; what Rules or Measures can be prescribed for our Worship of him?

Whist.
Vol. iv.
P. 169.

When 'tis said, *Honour the King*; we know how to perform the Command, because we know what Honour is due to the King, who is a *Man of like Passions with our selves*, whose Nature, Authority, and Relation to us we fully understand.

1 Pet. 2.
17.

So likewise when 'tis said *worship God*; we easily comprehend what our Duty is without farther Directions; because that which may be known of God is manifest to us, both from *Nature and Revelation*; and we are fully acquainted with all the divine Attributes and Perfections which are the Foundations of our Worship and Obedience. But should we be commanded to honour a Being of inferior Attributes and Perfections than God, but greater than Man;

we

we could not tell, without very particular Directions, how to order our Behaviour toward him.

For example; had it been said in Scripture, *ye shall Worship Angels*; all that we could understand by such a Precept would be, that if Angels should appear to us now, as they did to the Fathers in the old Testament, we should bow down to them, and honour them as we do our Princes, when we are in their Presence; and desire them to employ all such good Offices in our behalf as they know to be in their Power, and we do not.

But supposing farther, that we were commanded to worship them as residing in Heaven, and standing about the Throne of God, without their appearing to us upon Earth, what Honour must we then shew them? Must we only acknowledge such of their Excellencies as are revealed to us, and praise them for their Love to Mankind; or may we also pray to them? If Prayer and Invocation be allowed, may we request them directly and immediately to help and assist us, or must we only desire them to convey our Petitions to God, and intercede with him for us? If we may address to them directly, may we ask them to bestow all manner of Blessings and Graces upon us, or pray to them only for the good things of this World? May we pray

to

to them in our Hearts as well as with our Lips? And may we pray to them every where, and at all times, for every thing that we want? Should such Worship as this be due to the Angels; should Men be commanded to pray *every where* to them *without doubting*, and in every thing by *Prayer and Supplication, with Thanksgiving make known their Requests to them*; then it follows that we must worship *Angels* just as we worship *God*, only giving them, in our Addresses, different Titles and Apellations; in the same manner as it would follow, upon a Supposition that Angels were to be worshipped, that we ought to worship all the other Angels with the same worship that we pay to *Michael*, only giving him the Title of *Archangel*, and acknowledging him to be the first of the Angelical Order.

And no other difference can be assigned in the worship we pay to the *Son*, and to the *Father*, than the using such Titles in our Addresses to them, as plainly result from those different Relations; supposing all their other Attributes and Perfections to be *equal*, or which is all one, equally or alike *infinite*. And if they are not so, we cannot tell what Worship or Honour is due to the *Son*, more than we are now allowed to pay to *Angels*, only the giving some higher Titles to him than we give to

F

any

any other of the heavenly Order of Beings, and in the *doing all things in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, for which we have an express command in Scripture: For, as to any direct Application to him, there's no ground at all, either in *Nature* or *Scripture* for it, upon any other Supposition but that of his being *God*; and if we worship him as *God*, we must worship him as *the one only true God*: that is we must *honour the Son, as we honour the Father*.

Mat. 6.
v. 6.

Heb. 7.
v. 25.

And indeed I do not see which way we can warrant our saying, *Christ have mercy upon us*, without believing Christ to be the *true God*, the *same God* with the *Father*: For this single Petition manifestly implies, that *the Son*, as well as *the Father*, *knoweth what things we have need of*; that he *heareth all our Prayers*, can *fulfil all our Desires*, and is *able to save us to the uttermost*. And, in short, that *whatsoever things the Father doth, these also doth the Son likewise*: And we can mean no more when we say, *O God, the Father of Heaven, have mercy upon us*.

This appears to me to be the true Doctrine of *Scripture*, concerning *Christ the Son of God*. And that this was likewise the Doctrine of the most ancient *Fathers*, will be evident

evident to any one who carefully and fairly examines the most judicious and elaborate Treatise of Bishop *Bull* upon this Subject: And therefore, 'till that be fully answered, there is no occasion to multiply Testimonies of the same kind: Especially with regard to Dr. *Clark*, who owns, that what he quotes from the *Ancient Writers*; is *al-* Introduct.
ledged, by way of *Illustration only*, *not* P. 17.
Proof: For which Reason, I shall in this place content my self with making a few general Observations upon the Judgment and Conduct of the first Christians in the Controversy before us: Which, I think, will amount to as good *Proofs* of the Point in Hand, as any particular Citations out of the Fathers could, and be of much more Weight than any *Illustrations* taken from their Writings; the Images and Comparisons which they make use of for this purpose, being upon account of the sublimity and difficulty of the Subject, more improper; and consequently, more capable of false and heretical Senies, than what they barely *testify*, or *affirm*.

I. *First*, I observe that the most Primitive Writers, who mention the Persons of the Trinity, occasionally only, without entering into any Controversy upon this Subject, keep close to Scripture, and generally use the same Language, and Expressions,

without offering at any farther Explications of their own. And, therefore, from these Writers we can receive no more Light concerning the *Divinity* of our Saviour, than we have from the Writers of the New Testament; only this Inference, I think, may fairly be drawn from their manner of writing, that since they call Christ *God*, apply the *Divine Attributes* to him, and *worship* him as *God*, without any guard, or limitation; it is a certain Sign that there was then no dispute in the Church concerning these Things, and that no such different Senses of the Word *God*, and different Notions of *Divine Worship*, as were afterwards given out by the *Arians*, were heard of, in their Time.

For the better Proof of which Observation, and because the Testimony of the first Christians, is of the greatest Authority, next to that of the inspired Penmen, and that their Writings are the best Comment upon Scripture; I have here subjoined a Collection of Passages taken out of those which we call the *Apostolical Fathers*; and they are such as relate wholly to the *Worship* of Christ, or to those *Attributes* and *Characters*, which are the proper Foundation of Worship; very few of which are quoted, either, by Dr. *Bull*, or Mr. *Whiston*, or Dr. *Clark*.

* *Clem. Ep. 1. Cor. Sect. 36. p. 29.* This is the way, beloved, in which we may find our Saviour, even Jesus Christ, the High Priest of all our Offerings, the Defender and Helper of our Weakness. By him are the Eyes of our Hearts opened, by him our foolish and darkened understanding rejoiceth to behold his wonderful Light.

Pol. Ep. Phil. §. 6. p. 55. Let us serve him in Fear, and with all Reverence as himself hath commanded, and as the Apostles and Prophets have taught us.

Sec. 12. p. 58. Now the God, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and he himself who is our everlasting High-priest, the Son of God, even Jesus Christ, build you up in Faith, and in Truth, and in all Meekness and Lenity; in Patience and Long-suffering, in Forbearance, and Chastity: And grant unto you a Lot, and Portion among his Saints; and us with you, and to all that are under the Heavens, who shall believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and in his Father, who raised him from the Dead.

Ignat. Ep. Ephes. §. 2. p. 65. It is fitting that you should by (a) all means glo-

* These Quotations are taken out of Dr. Wake, the Bishop of Lincoln's most accurate Translation of the Apostolical Fathers, from divers Originals; some still MS.

(a) Καὶ πάντα τῶν, Ox. Ed. 1708. p. 42.

rify Jesus Christ, who hath glorified you ; that by a uniform Obedience, ye may be perfectly joined together in the same mind.

§. 20. p. 73. If Jesus Christ shall give me Grace, through your Prayers, and if it be his Will ; I purpose, in a second Epistle, -- to manifest to you, more fully, the Dispensation, of which I have now begun to speak ; ----- especially, if the Lord shall (b) make known unto me, that ye all, by Name, come together in common, in one Faith ; and in one Jesus Christ, who was of the Race of *David*, according to the Flesh ; the Son of Man and Son of God.

§. 21. *ib.* Remember me, as Jesus Christ does remember you.

Ep. Magnes. §. 15. p. 83. Farewel, and be ye strengthened in the Concord of God (c) ; enjoying his inseparable Spirit, which is Jesus Christ.

Ep. Trall. §. 1. p. 87. *Polybius*, your Bishop, --- who came to me to *Smyrna*, by the (d) will of God, and Jesus Christ.

§. 2. *ib.* Be ye subject to your Presbyters, as the Apostles of Jesus Christ our Hope ; in whom, if we walk, we shall be found in him.

(b) Ἀποκαλύψῃ, *Ib.* p. 54.

(c) Κεκλημένοι ἀδιάκλειον πνεῦμα ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, *Ib.* p. 68.

(d) Θελήματι Θεῷ καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, *Ib.* p. 80.

Ep. Rom. §. 4. p. 98. (e) Pray unto Christ for me, that by these Instruments, I may be made the Sacrifice of God.

§. 5. p. 99. Only let me enjoy Jesus Christ.

§. 8. p. 100. Jesus Christ will shew you that I speak truly.

§. 9. Ib. Remember in your Prayers, the Church of Syria, which now enjoys God for its Shepherd, instead of me: (f) Let Jesus Christ, only, oversee it, and your Charity.

Ep. Philad. §. 5. p. 106. Having a great Joy in you, I endeavour to secure you against Danger: (g) Or, rather, not I, but Jesus Christ, in whom being bound—

§. 7. p. 108. He is my Witness, for whose sake I am in Bonds, that I knew nothing from any Man.

§. 8. Ib. I trust in the Grace of Jesus Christ, that he will free you from every Bond.

§. 11. p. 110. (h) May our Lord Jesus Christ honour them, in whom they hope, both in Flesh, and Soul, and Spirit, in Faith, in Love, in Unity: Farewel in Christ Jesus, our common Hope.

(e) Λίαν δ' αἶτε ἡ Χεὶρ ἐν ὑμῶν ἐμῶν, *Ib. p. 94.* Juxta Ed. Ru nart.

(f) Μόνον αὐτὴν Ἰησοῦς Χεὶρ ἐπισκοπήσει, *Ib. p. 98.*

(g) Οὐκ ἐγὼ ἢ ἀλλ' Ἰησοῦς Χεὶρ. *Ib. p. 72.*

(h) Τιμήσει αὐτοὺς, *Ib. p. 78.*

Ep. Smyrn. §. 1. p. 114. (i) I Glorify God, even Jesus Christ, who hath given you such Wisdom.

§. 4. p. 115. You must pray for them, that, if it be the Will of God, they may repent; which yet will be very hard. But of this our Lord Jesus Christ hath the Power, who is our true Life.

Ib. In the Name of Jesus Christ, I undergo all to suffer together with him; he who was made a perfect Man, strengthening me.

§. 9. p. 118. Ye have refresh'd me in all things, so shall Jesus Christ you.

Ep. to Polyc. Inscr. p. 118. Ignatius to Polycarp, Bishop of the Church which is at Smyrna; their Overseer, but rather himself overlook'd by God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

Ignat. Martyrd. §. 5. p. 139. Tra. Who is Theophorus? *Ignat.* He who has Christ in his Breast? *Tra.* Do not we then seem to thee to have the Gods within us, who fight against our Enemies? *Ignat.* You err in that you call the Evil Spirits of the Heathens Gods: For there is but one God, who made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea, and all that are in them; And one Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son; whose Kingdom may I injoy.

(i) Δοξάζων ἃ Χριστὸν, ἃ Θεόν, ἃ Ἰησοῦς ἡμᾶς σοφίσαντα,
Ib. p. 20.

§. 6. *Ib.* His, who crucified my Sin with the Inventor of it, and has put all the Deceit and Malice of the Devil, under the Feet of those who carry him in their Heart.

§. 7. *p.* 132. I thank thee, O Lord, that thou hast vouchsafed to honour me with a perfect Love towards thee; and hast made me to be put in iron Bonds, with thy Apostle *Paul*.

§. 9. *p.* 133. He intreated --- the whole Church --- but more particularly *Polycarp*, to contend with God in his Behalf; that being suddenly taken from the World, he might appear before the Face of Christ.

§. 12. *p.* 135. (*k*) He prayed to the Son of God, in behalf of the Churches; that he would put a stop to the Persecution, and continue the Love of the Brethren towards each other.

Polyc. Martyrd. Inscript. Mercy, Peace, and Love from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ be multiplied.

§. 9. *p.* 145. *Polycarp* replied, Eighty and six Years have I now (*l*) served Christ, and he has never done me the least wrong: How then can I blaspheme my King and my Saviour?

(*k*) Οὐλῶ μὲν γονυκλισίας πάντων τῶν Ἀδελφῶν προ-
καλίσας τὴν ὑπὸν τῶ Θεοῦ ὑπὸ ἐκκλησιῶν, ὑπὸ τῶν διωγμῶν
καταπαύσεως, ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀδελφῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους ἀγάπης,
Grabe Spic. Patr. Vol. 2. p. 20.

(*l*) Δεδούκων αὐτῷ, *Cot. Antw. 1698. v. 2. §. 9. p. 196.*

§. 17. *p.* 149, 150. Left (says he) forsaking him that was crucified, they should begin to worship this *Polycarp*; — not considering, that neither is it possible for us ever to forsake Christ; — Nor (*m*) worship any other besides him. For him, indeed, as being the Son of God, we do (*n*) adore: But for the Martyrs, we worthily love them, as the Disciples, and Followers, of the Lord.

§. 19. *p.* 151. He now together with the Apostles, — glorifies God, even the Father; and blesses our Lord the Governour both of [*(o)* our Souls] and Bodies, and the Shepherd of the Catholick Church, which is over all the Earth.

§. 20. *Ib.* Jesus Christ; to whom be Glory, and Honour, and Power, and Majesty, for ever and ever, *Amen*.

§. 22. *p.* 152. Jesus Christ: With whom Glory be to God, (and) the Father, and the Holy Spirit, for the Salvation of (*p*) his chosen Saints, after whose Example, the blessed *Polycarp* suffered, at whose Feet may we be found, in the Kingdom of Jesus Christ.

Ep. Barnab. §. 6. *p.* 169. --- The spiritual Meaning of this is, — Put your Trust in Je-

(*m*) (*n*) Σέβω, *Ib.* §. 17. *p.* 200.

(*o*) Animorum vet. Interp. deest. Gr. *Ib.* §. 19. *p.* 201.

(*p*) Ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῇ ᾧ ἁγίων ἐκλελεγάν, *Ib.* §. 22. *p.* 102.

fus, who shall be manifested to you in the Flesh.

§. 8. p. 194. They that put their Trust in him shall live for ever.

§. 19. p. 190. Thou shalt love him that made thee; — Thou shalt glorify him that hath redeemed thee from Death.

§. 21. p. 195. The Lord of Glory, and of all Grace, be with your Spirit.

The Shep. of Herm. Vis. 2. §. 2. p. 206. The Lord hath sworn by his Son, that who-so denieth his Son, and him, — he will also deny him in the World that is to come.

Sim. 9. §. 14. p. 324. The Name of the Son of God is great, and without Bounds, and the whole World is supported by it. — Seest thou not, — that he does support them, who with all their Heart bear his Name?

§. 28. p. 337. Ye who suffer Death, for his Name sake [*viz.* Christ's] ought to (*q*) honour the Lord, that he hath esteemed you worthy to bear his Name; confess that ye have (*r*) the Lord for your God; lest, at any time, denying him, ye be delivered over into Bonds. For, if all Nations punish their Servants which deny their Ma-

(*q*) Dominum honorare [*Lam. orare*] quod Dignos vos habet [*habeat*] Dominus Cot. V. r. p. 121.

(*r*) Confiteamini vos habere Dominum Deum Cot. V. r. §. 28. p. 121.

fters; what think you that the Lord will do unto you, who has the Power of all things?

Clem. Ep. 2. §. 1. p. 1349. (s) Brethren, we ought so to think of Jesus Christ, as of God; --- For if we think meanly of him, we shall hope only to receive some small things from him. And, if we do so, we shall Sin: ----- For, indeed, how great are those Advantages which we owe to him, in relation to our Holiness? He has illuminated us; as a Father, he hath called us his Children; he has saved us who were lost and undone; what praise shall we give to him? Or, what Reward that may be answerable to those things which we have received? &c. to the end of Sect.

§. 3. *p. 351, 352.* Wherein must we confess him? (Christ) viz. in doing those things which he saith, and not disobeying his Commandments: By worshipping him, not with our Lips only, but with all our Heart, and with all our Mind: For he saith in *Isaiah*, this People honoureth me with their Lips, but their Heart is far from me.

§. 4. *Ib.* Let us then, not only call him Lord, for that will not save us. For he saith, not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, &c. --- Wherefore, Brethren, let us

(s) Οὐλος δὲ ἡμᾶς φερειν ως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὡς καὶ Θεοῦ,
Ib. p. 184.

confess him by our Work; by loving one another, &c.

S. 6. p. 353. If we do the Will of Christ, we shall find rest. ---

2. The Fathers, who lived after the Disputes concerning the *Trinity* arose, express themselves more particularly and largely upon all the Points in Controversy, than those before quoted do, both when they deliver their own Sentiments, and when they confute the Opinions of Hereticks. But then, they all explain themselves very differently, and mix Philosophy and Human Reasonings with Scripture, just as we do now: And therefore, no particular Explications of theirs, not warranted by Scripture-language, or unquestionable Tradition, can be of any more Authority than those of Modern Divines.

The chief Matters in which these Fathers express themselves with great Variety, and (as Dr. Clark observes) oftentimes, with *P. 288.* Ambiguity and Uncertainty, are the Generation of the Son, and his Subordination to the Father.

As to the *Generation of the Son*, some of the ancient Writers talk of him as eternally existing in the Bosom, Bowels, or Heart of the Father, but proceeding forth, and manifesting himself as a distinct Person, from the Father, just before the Creation of the

the World, in order to be employed in that Work. Which Notion, however Philosophical it may appear, and hard to be understood, manifestly shews, that those who express themselves after such a manner, must have believed the Son to be *Eternal*.

Others speak of Christ as the Son of God, *Begotten before all Worlds*, much in the same Language that the Scriptures do, without determining any thing farther concerning the *time* or *manner* of his *Generation*. And from hence, some Controversies have arisen concerning the meaning of these Terms; *Begotten*, and *before all Worlds*: The *Arians* alledging, that the Word which the Orthodox translate *Begotten*, may as properly be rendred *Created*; and this Phrase, *Before all Worlds*, with other equivalent Expressions, may mean no more, than just before the *Mosaick Creation*, and that the Fathers are to be understood in this Sense, and no other. But, whatever Words were used by any of the ancient Writers, upon this Head, they generally agree in declaring, that the *Generation* of the Son was *ineffable*, and not to be explained by Language.

Some of them who endeavoured to enter farther into this Mystery than the rest, seem to assert, that the *Son* was of the *same Nature, Essence, and Substance* with the Father, and consequently, *Coeternal* also.

But

BUT what they have said in maintenance of this Doctrine, has occasioned several Disputes concerning the meaning of *ὑπόστασις*, and *οὐσία*, *Substantia* & *Subsistentia*, with several other Words made use of by the Greeks and Latins, in explaining the Divine Nature of Christ. And from hence, likewise, hath another Question been raised, whether the Generation of the Son were necessary, or voluntary, whether he existed by the Necessity of his own Nature, or the will of the Father.

And with the same Variety of Language have these Ancient Writers delivered their Notions concerning the Subordination of the Son to the Father. Some of them express themselves in such a manner, as if they believed them equal in all their Perfections, and that there was no difference between them, but that of Order or Place. Others have given such a Pre-eminence to the Father, by making the Titles of *Ἀυτοθεός* & *ὁ ἐκ πατρὸς Θεός*, peculiar to him, and by calling him the Fountain, Root, Cause, and Principle of the Sons Divinity, with other the like Titles, that from hence it is supposed by some to have been their Opinion, that the Son is far inferiour to the Father, in Nature, Attributes and Perfections.

But, notwithstanding all the Difference of Expression, and different way of Reasoning, used by the Ecclesiastical Writers, in treating

ting of these Points; it is agreed by the learned of all Communions, belonging to the Catholick Church, that the Judgment of all the Fathers upon the whole is this; that *Christ the Word, and Son of God*, is truly and properly *Eternal*, of the *same Substance* with the Father, and *equal* to him in all other Respects, excepting that he *received his Being* from the Father.

There is no doubt of this Matter, so far as concerns the Fathers of the *Nicene Council*, and those that have written since. And as to the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, Bishop *Pearson*, Bishop *Bull*, and Dr. *Grabe*, who have taken a great deal of Pains in examining their Works, the two latter having carefully collected what has been said by them, purely in order to discover their true Sentiments, are all of them of Opinion, that the Doctrine of these Fathers was upon a fair Comparison, the same with that of the *Nicene Council*. And the latest and most zealous Defender of *Arianism*, who pretends to have made the like diligent perusal of these Authours, does from the Accounts they give of the Son of God, conclude that he is *Δόξῃ Θεῷ ᾠκεῖν ὡμοῦν*; that he is in some sort *Eternal*, but that the Eternity to be ascribed to him, is only a *Metaphysical Eternity*, that ἡν ὡς οὐκ ὄντι ἔκ τῆς ἡν was, when started by *Arius*, a *novel Doctrine*, and *rash Expression*; that he was in an *extraordinary*

Ivhi. Vol.
iv. p. 112.
p. 127.
2 Appen.
to
p. 12.
Vol. iv.
p. 77.

ordinary and singular manner, derived from the Father; that he was begotten, but not like other Beings that are begotten; Created, but not like other created Beings; made, but not like other Beings that were made. Creed of Eunomius, highly approved by Mr. Whiston. That ὁ υἱος ὁυτος ἦν , ought not to be said; that perchance he was produced out of the substance of the Father, according to the Notion even of early Ages; that he is a Being, or Person of super-eminent and divine Perfections, and that he, together with the Father, and the Spirit, is the Maker and Governour of the World.

App. to
Vol. iv.

p. 52.

2 App. to
H. Pr.

p. 12.

Vol. iv.

p. 77.

p. 104.

Serm. &

Eff. p. 215.

From all which I infer, that the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers do not speak very plainly in favour of *Arianism*; since both *Orthodox* and *Arians* agree in such Interpretations of their Doctrine, concerning *Christ*, as do no ways suit the Notion we have of a *Creature*: Whereas, had that been their real Opinion, that *Christ* was only a *Creature*, tho' of a higher Order than the rest, they must have abounded in such Expressions signifying his being a *Creature*, as could no more have been mistaken, than the Expressions of the modern *Arians*, when they speak their own Language, and not that of the Fathers. There would then have been no mystery or difficulty in the Thing: They would not have scrupled to say, that *there was a time when he was not*; they would

G

have

wh. Vol.
iv. p. 127.

have told us, that *He was made just as other things were made, and brought into Being, as the Sun and Moon were brought into Being*; that his *Knowledge, Power, and other Perfections were limited, and far inferiour* to those of the *Father*. But since we meet with no such Explications as these in any of the Ecclesiastical Writers, before the *Council of Nice*; since, after a long and sharp Contention between the *Orthodox* and *Arians*, the present Catholick Doctrine always prevailed; and since the *Arians* themselves, soon after the first breaking out of their Heresy, were divided into several Parties; and since both the *Arians*, and *Semi-Arians*, who lived nearest the *Nicene Council*, came likewise much nearer to the *Catholicks* in the Explication of their Doctrine, than the Modern *Arians* do; it is reasonable to conclude from hence, that none of the *new* and *unscriptural* Terms, used by any of the *Anti-Nicene* Fathers, are to be taken in an *Arian* Sense.

But, supposing some of the many different Ways of speaking, used by them, were capable of such a Construction; yet, why should these be of more Authority than those many other Expressions, we find in those Writings, which are entirely Orthodox? And many such there are, by Mr. *Whiston's* own Confession, who for that Reason, *Excludes Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian,*

Vol. iv.
P. 2.

an, out of the Number of those *Primitive Writers*, from whom he collects the *Proofs*, and *Illustrations* of his *Faith*, concerning the *Trinity*. And the same is allowed by all the other *Arians*, who give up *Justin Martyr* as *Orthodox*, tho' magnified by Mr. *Whiston*, as favouring his Cause. The most therefore, that can be concluded by any Heretic whatever, from the different *Citations* and *Testimonies* brought out of these *Primitive Records* is, that since none of the unscriptural Ways of speaking, found in the ancient Writers, are proved to be delivered down to them by certain and unquestionable *Tradition*; none of them are sufficient to determine our Faith, either way; and then it follows, that the best *Account* we can have of the *Primitive Doctrine*, concerning the Son of God is, by considering those Forms of speaking, in which the ancient Fathers all agree; and in using of which, they are least liable to be mistaken themselves, or to mislead others.

Vid. Bull.
Vol. iv.
p. 128.

3. Now all the Fathers agree unanimously thus far, that the *Father is God*, and the *Son God*; that the *Son*, as well as the *Father*, is to be worshipped with *Divine Worship*; that *there is but one God*; and that *Christians are obliged to worship this one God, and no other*. There is no *Arian*, I believe, who disputes this Matter.

Vol. iv.

P. 85.

P. 324.

Jesus Christ (says Mr. *Whiston*) is truly *God and Lord*, — our *God and our Lord*, our *King and our Judge*. And *Divine Honour and Worship* is to be paid him, not only by obeying him as our *Lord*; by baptizing into his *Name*; by wishing *Grace and Peace* from him; and by *Doxologies*; but by proper *Adoration*; by direct and distinct *Invocation*, and *thanksgiving* to him also.

4. It is more particularly remarkable upon this Head, that all the Ancient *Apolo-gists*, and such as expressly undertook the defence of the Christian Religion against *Un-believers*, insist very much upon the *Unity of God*, and never assert a *Plurality* of Gods in any Sense whatsoever. They press the *Heathen* with the Necessity of worshipping but *one God*, the God that made *Heaven and Earth*; and are very large in exposing the Absurdity of having more Gods than one, as may be seen in *Athenagoras*, and *Justin Martyr's* Addresses to *Roman Emperors*, and *Theophilus Antiochenus* his Discourse with *Autolycus*, a *Heathen Philosopher*. And so likewise when they have to deal with *Jews*; they openly and plainly declare that they have the same God that the *Jews* had, the maker of the *Universe*, the God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, as particularly *Justin* in his *Dial. with Trypho*, p. 227,

p. 227, 228. quoted by Mr. *Whiston*. And Vol. iv.
yet all the same Fathers, in these very Di- P. 31.

scourses, where they profess their Belief in one God, the only God of the *Jews*, *Gentiles*, and *Christians*, the *Maker* and *Governour* of the *Universe*, and their Obligation to worship this one God and no other, do at the same time acknowledge Christ to be God, and profess to worship him as such; so that what *Origen* says, *l. 8.*

Cont. Cels. p. 386. ἵνα Θεὸν ἡμεῖς καὶ τὸν υἱὸν θεοῦ προσκυνοῦμεν may be looked upon as a short Vid. *Wh*
Vol. iv.
p. 49.

Summary of the common Faith and Practice of the first Christians, with relation to this Grand Article. And what can be inferred less from this concurrent Testimony of all the Fathers, than that Christ is *truly God*, in the present Sense of the Catholick Church?

5. The Truth of which Inference will be more evident from the next Observation I shall make: Which is, that the true Christians who worshipped Christ, seem to have entertained no Doubts or Scruples at all upon this Account concerning a *Plurality of Gods*: And therefore, in no Discourses written for the use of *Believers*, whether *Jewish* or *Gentile* Converts, are there any such Arguments brought to justify the worship of *Christ*, as that he was *God by the appointment of the Father*; that he was

to be worshipped, only because God *commanded it*; and that God could set up any *inferiour Objects* of Worship, provided the *Supreme degree of Adoration* were reserved to himself; or the like.

The *Jews* in our Saviour's time had very strict Notions of the *Unity of God*: and therefore the Apostles, in their Discourses to them never mention any thing of this first Principle of Religion, but taking it for granted, insist wholly upon Christ's being the *Messiah*, or Son of God. On the contrary, when they preach to the *Gentiles*, they instruct them in the Knowledge of the *one God, the Maker of Heaven and Earth*, before they teach them to believe in Christ. How could then *the Jews*, who were so afraid of *Idolatry*, and *the Heathen* who were so addicted to it, and so accustomed to the Notion of *many Deities*, under the *one Supreme*, both joyn in the Worship of *Christ*, without the least Apprehension of a *Plurality of Gods*, unless they had been thoroughly convinced that *Christ* was the same *God* with the *Father*.

6. And that this was the true *Catholick Faith*, upon the first Publication of Christianity, is farther confirmed by the Accounts that are given us of the most *ancient Heresies*.

The earliest Heresy that we meet with in the *Apostolical Fathers*, was, that of the *Docetae*, who said that Christ did not take upon him *true Flesh*, that he did not *truly* suffer, but only *seemed* to suffer, and so whatever he did as Man, was done in *Shew* and *Appearance* only, and not in *Reality*. From whence 'tis obvious to infer, not only that these Hereticks did certainly believe Christ to be *true God*, but that the whole Body of Christians did then believe so too; and that the Reason why any of them denied the *Humanity* of Christ, was, because the Proofs of his being God appeared so strong, that they could not withstand them, and yet they could not conceive how the *great God of Heaven and Earth* could be *made Flesh*, and *dwell among us*.

There were other *Hereticks* about the same time, who looked upon our Saviour only as *mere Man*. But these were for the most part, Men of Carnal Minds, who did not understand the *Power*, either of God, or *Godliness*, whose Character, in the main, was, that they were *sensual*, *not having the Spirit*: And these *false Teachers*, prophesied of by St. Peter, who thus *denied the Lord that bought them*, might probably be confirmed in that *damnable Heresy*, by the Arguments made use of at that time to prove Christ *truly Man*, in opposition to

2 Pet. 2. 1.

those who affirmed that he was *only God*. But even the denial of Christ's Divinity, by these Men, is a Proof of his being the *supreme God*, in the Judgment of the *Orthodox*; because it was in this Sense only, that they denied him to be God. For it does not appear by any thing offered in defence of their Opinions, that they had any other Notion of God, than we have now when we speak of *God* absolutely. Neither have *Socinus*, and his Followers, who have revived this old Heresy, preached any other Doctrine concerning God. The *Son*, according to them, is not God, because the *Father* is God, and there is none else; and those of them who allow of the Worship of Christ, profess to Worship the Father, and him only, as manifesting himself *in and by* Christ.

Another Heresy which appeared very early in the Church, was that which was afterwards called *Sabellian*; the chief Article of which was, that the *Father* and *Son* were only different *Denominations* of the same God, and that there was no other personal Distinction between them. This Doctrine prevailed very much towards the latter end of the second *Century*, and *Praxeas*, the most considerable *Promoter* of it, was in great Reputation with some of the chief Bishops of that Age; from whence it may be fairly collected, that it was the common

common Language of the Orthodox, which gave rise to this false Opinion, and that those who embraced it were chiefly moved to do so, by the strong Proofs they had before received of Christ's Divinity, the justness of which Inference is very much confirmed by what Mr. *Whiston* observes of *Tertullian*, in these words; *nay, which is exceeding remarkable, himself owns that such Notions and Expressions as he ventured upon were disapproved, and disowned by the greatest part of Christians, who look'd on them as inconsistent with the Fundamental Doctrine of the Gospel, the Belief of one God*: Which observation of his he justifies, by citing a passage out of *Tertullian*, where he affirms thus of the greatest part of Christians in his time ---

Numerum & Dispositionem Trinitatis Divisionem præsumunt unitatis. --- Itaque duos & tres jam jactitant a nobis prædicari, severo unius Dei cultores præsumant, &c. Vol. iv. p. 189.

The number and disposition of the Persons in the Trinity, they look upon as a Division of the unity. --- And therefore, they cry out that we preach up two or three Gods; but boast that they are the worshippers of the one God. Now this being said in a Book written against *Praxeas*, who asserted that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were only three Names of God; it follows, that the greatest part of Christians, Adv. Prax. l. 3. p. 635.

meaning

meaning the *Simplices quique*, --- *quæ major semper credentium pars est*, As *Tertullian* calls them in the beginning of the Passage here cited, had much the same Notion of the Trinity that *Praxeas* had then; and that the Occasion of this Error, both in *Praxeas*, and the generality of Christians, in that Age, was their zeal and concern for the *Unity of God*; which there could have been no ground for, should we suppose with the *Arians*, that the Word God was then commonly taken in different Senses, when applied to the Father, and to the Son, and that the Catholick Faith of this Age, was, that the *Father alone was truly God*, and that *Christ* was a mere Creature, improperly styled so.

On the contrary, it is more reasonable to believe that those *New Notions*, and *Expressions*, which Mr. *Whiston* says were *ventured upon* by *Tertullian*, and he might have said by other Fathers too, who were at great pains to suppress the growing Heresy of *Praxeas*, which was propagated afterwards by *Sabellius*, and others, made way for *Arianism*; the Terms which these Fathers used in this dispute for explaining the *distinction of Persons* in the *Trinity*, being (as it happens in most other Controversies) bent too far the contrary way. But had *Arius* appeared in the World when *Praxeas* did, the Language of the Fathers would

would in all probability have been the same before, as it was after the *Nicene Council*. For which reason, it cannot truly be concluded, from any Expressions used by the primitive Fathers, which seem to favour *Arianism*, that they were *Arians*, any more than it can be proved from those Passages of *Athanasius* and *Basil*, Bishop *Pearson*, and Bishop *Bull*, which are cited by Dr. *Clark*, that they did not believe *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be one and the same God*. That the Opinion of all these Writers was what we call *Orthodox*, notwithstanding all the Passages cited by Dr. *Clark* out of them, which seem to him not very consistent with it, will not be denied by Dr. *Clark* himself: And I think, it may as fairly be inferred from the Passages cited by Bishop *Bull* out of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, that they were really of the same Opinion with these Writers, tho' they Introd. P. 18. do not always speak so clearly and consistently, but that some Passages in their Writings may appear more favourable, either to Mr. *Whiston's* or Dr. *Clark's* Opinion.

7. Another Observation may be made, which will plainly shew, how little they are to be depended upon in settling *Primitive Christianity*, who endeavour to defend their singular Notions, concerning the *Divinity* of our Saviour, by Testimonies
out

P. 332.

out of the Fathers; when the very same Persons do upon the like Authority give us as strange an Account of the *Humanity* of Christ. Nothing sure can be plainer in the Writings of all Ages since the Gospel was published, than that Christ was true and perfect Man, made *like unto his Brethren in all things, sin only excepted*: And yet, Mr. *Whiston* thinks it the true Doctrine of Antiquity, that Christ had not a *Humane Soul*, but that the Place of it was supplied by his *Divinity*. And by the 38th *Prop.* of Dr. *Clark*, this appears to be his Opinion too. So that, in short, the whole design of what they have both advanced, concerning our Saviour, is to prove, that he was *neither God nor Man*: For if Christ be not *truly God*, and *truly Man*, according to the common Sense, in which these Words were understood before his Appearance in the Flesh, he must be some other Being, to which these Names do neither of them belong. But if it be allowed to be the Doctrine of the Fathers, that Christ was *truly Man*, notwithstanding what these Gentlemen have alledged to the contrary; (as the generality of the *Arians*, as well as all other Sects, will allow) it may as fairly be supposed, that they believed him to be *truly God*, in the most common obvious sense of the Word, when they frequently style him God, and use many Arguments to prove him

him so, notwithstanding what is quoted from them by the *Arians*, and some others, to shew that he might be *truly God*, and yet not the same God with the Father, who is the *one and only God of the Christians*.

III. I pass now to the third thing proposed in the beginning of this Discourse, which was to make some particular Remarks upon such Passages in Dr. *Clark's* Book, as have not been considered in the Proof of the two former Points, and seem to favour the contrary Doctrine.

Chap. I. *Of God the Father.*

In the three first Sections of this Chapter are collected the Passages of the New Testament, wherein mention is made of *the one or only God*; where the Word *God* is used *Absolutely*; and where *some high Title, Epithet, or Attribute* is annexed to the Word *God*. And in all these Passages Dr. *Clark* says *The Scripture means the person of the Father*.

§. 1.
§. 2.
§. 3.

P. 245,
263, 265.

With what Truth and Propriety this is said, hath in general been observed before, but will more evidently appear from the following Remarks.

In order to justify the Application of these Texts to the *Person of the Father*, Dr. *Clark* must reasonably be presumed to say, that they belong to the Father *exclusively*

Vol. iv.
P. 21.

ly of the Son. He ought, indeed, directly to have affirmed with Mr. *Whiston*, that *the Father, as contradistinguished from Jesus Christ, is the true God, nay the only true God*, and that as thus contradistinguished he is *God absolutely*, and *the God of Heaven and Earth, the Living God, the most High*: from whence it plainly follows, that *Christ* is not *God* in any such Sense; that is, he is not *the one God*, nor *God absolutely*, nor *God with any high Title, Epithet, or Attribute*; and consequently, that he is not *God* at all.

P. 477.

But 'tis probable that Dr. *Clark* will not say that the Person of the Father is to be understood in any of these Texts, as exclusive of the Son; because he tells us in another place, that *God the Father Almighty is not to be considered by us singly*, — but that *with him always are his Son and his Spirit, by immediate ineffable derivation from him, and intimate Union and Communion with him*. But then it may be fairly

P. 50.

replied, that the Word *God*, in all these Passages ought not to be confined to the *Person of the Father only*; But is applicable to the *Divine Nature* considered *absolutely*, without any distinction of Persons; excepting only where the *Construction itself necessarily* implies such Distinction; or else, if we take in the Notion of different Persons, then where-ever mention is

is made of God *absolutely*, or, *the one God, the true God, &c.* the meaning must be, that the Father, *considered with his Son and Spirit*, is God, the one God, the true God, &c.

This seems to be the plain natural Construction of all the Passages cited in these three Sections: but this is not Dr. Clark's way of understanding them; for the Reason of his *confining* these Texts, *to the Person of the Father only*, is, that, according to his Notion of the Trinity, the Word God, is to be taken in a different Sense, when it is applied to the *Father*, and when it signifies *the Son*, or *the Spirit*: And so likewise are all the Words made use of in Scripture to express the *Attributes* of God; or to shew what *Honour* and *Worship* is to be paid him; as will appear from the following Passages.

Sect. I. Mar. 12. 32. There is one God, p. 3. and there is none other but he.

Viz. *Strictly and properly in the absolute and supreme Sense.*

That *the Words one and only*, when applied to God, should be *used by way of eminence*, and not *Exclusion*, must needs seem very strange to those who are so remarkably distinguished from the rest of the World by their Belief in *one God*. However, if this be the true meaning of the Text;

Text; then it must be said, that *Christ* is not *strictly* and *properly* God, but only by a *loose* and *improper* use of the Word is stiled so : That he is not God in the *absolute* and *supreme* Sense of the Word, but in a *Relative* and *Inferiour* Sense only ; and so in a *more improper*, and still *lower* Sense, the *Holy Ghost* is God.

Then it follows likewise, that tho' there be, *properly Speaking*, but one God, yet in some Sense or other, there are *three Gods* ; that is, as properly as the *Son* and *Spirit* are called God, so properly may it be said, that there are *three Gods* ; or else it must be affirmed that, *properly speaking*, neither *Son* nor *Spirit* is *God* : one or other of these Consequences is unavoidable, if the Doctor's comment upon this Text be allowed.

p. 65.

SECT. III. 1 Tim. 6. 16. Who only hath Immortality.

That is, who only hath it of himself, absolute, and underived, and independent of any.

This is the Doctors Note upon this Text, and in the same manner are all the Divine Attributes explained.

p. 244.

The Father (or first Person) alone is in the highest, strict, and proper Sense, absolutely supreme over all.

Ib.

The Father (or first Person) alone is, absolutely speaking, the God of the Universe,

The

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity. 97

*The Father only is Eternal of himself; p. 431.
by self existence and absolute necessity of
Nature.*

*The Father is called the only Lord God, p. 433;
because he only is Lord by original unde-
rived Authority.*

*The Father is called God only wise, be- Ib.
cause he only hath Wisdom unoriginated.*

*The Father is stiled the only Potentate, Ib.
because he only hath power absolutely and
originally of himself.*

But, if all the Divine Titles and Attributes are appropriated to the Father, with no other Distinctions but these, then it must be allowed that *Christ hath Immortality*, and is *Eternal*, as well as the Father, tho' not of himself, and independent of the Father; that he is *absolutely supreme over all*, tho' not in the highest Sense; or, at least, that he is *Supreme over all*, tho' not absolutely Supreme; that he is the *God of the Universe*, tho' not absolutely speaking so; that he is *Lord over all*, tho' not by original underived Authority; and that his *Power* and *Wisdom* are *Infinite*, tho' neither of them be unoriginated. And, if this be allowed, wherein is *Christ* distinguished from the *Father*, but only as he is a Son? For, take away the Distinctions of *Father* and *Son*, and *Christ* is *God*, in the full import and extent of the Word, viz. An eternal
H Being,

Being, infinitely Wise and Powerful, and Supreme Lord of the Universe.

It is farther to be observed upon these three Sections in general; that if the word *God*, when mentioned *absolutely*, is applied to *the Son* in Scripture; then not only the Passages collected in the second Section, are very improperly ranged under their Title; but the first and third Sections are altogether useless. For if Christ be *God absolutely*; he is also *the only God, the living God, the everlasting God, &c.* There is no need of using any of those Titles and Epithets with regard to Christ; (tho' many of them are, by Dr. Clark's own Confession, applied to him in Scripture, as (a) *Lord of all*, (b) *Lord of Glory*, (c) *the First and the Last, &c.*) because they are known to be contained under the common Notion of *God*, which all the *Jews* at our Saviour's coming were possessed of, and which all *the Gentiles* were taught before the Gospel was preached to them.

(a) p. 118.

(b) p. 120.

(c) p. 128.

But had not Christ been God, in the same Sense, in which the Word was understood before his Appearance in the Flesh, it is very reasonable to believe that he would have been stiled *God* (if he had taken upon him that Name at all) with some *lower Titles, Epithets, or Attributes* than the Father was; as *Partaker of Divine Glory, Divine Person, and the like*: Or, at least, with

with some Exceptions; as God, but *not the most High*; Lord, but *not Lord of all*. So when it is said that *the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him* (which is a Text that Dr. Clark has no where explained) we should probably have been told that it was not *the eternal Godhead* here meant, as Rom. I. 20. but *Divine Power*, P. 317: as the Word *Θεότης* is rendred by Dr. Clark. And so likewise the Rule for Worship would in all probability have been, *Honour the Son, but not as ye honour the Father*. This I should think would have been the Language of Scripture, if Christ had not been *the same God*, with the Father.

Sect. IV. The fourth Section contains P. 69: the *Passages of the New Testament*, wherein is set forth the *Honour and Worship* due to the Person of the Father. And the principal Text to which all our Remarks upon this Head may be referred, is this,

Luke 4. 8. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.

If this be meant of the *Father only*, then the immediate Consequence is, that no worship is due to the *Son*: But that neither this, nor any of the Passages in this Section, are to be applied to the Father, *exclusively* of the *Son*, is plain from what he tells us in another place, *that the Father is not to be served exclusive of the Son*. We are there- P. 353:

fore to understand these Passages in such a Sense only as shews, that the *Father* is to be worshipped in some *more eminent manner*, or with some *higher Degree* of Worship than the *Son* or *Spirit*; according to the Rule before laid down concerning the use of these Words *one* and *only*.

p. 245.

What this *pre-eminence* of worship is, which he looks upon to be due to the Father only, we may learn from the Title of this Section, and from many other Passages throughout his Book.

p. 69.

Sect. 4. All Prayers and Praises, ought *primarily* to be offered to the Father, and every thing ought to be directed *ultimately* to his Honour and Glory.

p. 352.

Absolutely supreme Honour is due to the Person of the Father singly.

Ib.

The Person of the Father, can alone be honoured as self-existent, independent, unoriginated, and absolutely supreme.

p. 353.

He alone is to be served as strictly and absolutely supreme.

p. 354.

All Prayers and Praises ought *primarily* or *ultimately* to be directed to the Person of the Father.

p. 362.

Whatever Honour is paid to the *Son* or *Spirit*, must always be understood, as tending finally to the Honour and Glory of the Father.

All that can be inferred from hence is; First, That there are some Titles and Characters properly belonging to the *Father*, as a *distinct Person*, which are not applicable to the *Son*.

Secondly, That, whenever we mention *Father and Son* together, in any kind of Worship or Honour that we pay them, we ought to mention the *Father first*; and where we ascribe the same things to both, we are to suppose them to be *originally in the Father*, and by *derivation or communication in the Son*.

But none of these distinctions alter any thing in our Notions, either of *God*, or *Divine Worship*. For, still we say that the *Son* is God, in the *same Sense* that the *Father* is God; and as God, he is to be worshipped with the *same Worship*; notwithstanding any such *personal Prerogatives* as are here ascribed to the Father.

There is, no doubt, Honour due to each person distinctly, upon account of their respective Characters, Powers and Offices: this is the acknowledged Doctrine of our Church, as Dr. Clark himself must allow; who in the five first Sections of the third part of his Book, has collected the principal Passages in the *Liturgy of the Church of England*; wherein (as he says) *the main Branches of his foregoing Doctrine, are expressly affirmed.* By all which, it plainly

p. 426.

appears, that we do in our publick Prayers
*Give distinctly to each of the three Persons
 that Honour, which the Scripture, directly,
 or by plain Consequence, commandeth to be
 given, respectively, to each of them.*

p. 292.

But, having been careful to maintain all
these personal Characters and Distinctions,
 we think our selves not only at Liberty,
 but obliged, in all other Respects to honour
the Son, even as we honour the Father.

Were we only to address our selves to
 God, *through Jesus Christ:*

Eph. 5.20.

Were we to pray and give thanks always,
 for all things unto God, and the Father,
 but only *in the Name of our Lord Jesus
 Christ:*

Were we only to wish *Grace and Peace
 from him;* and never to make any direct
 application to him:

Or were we commanded to *pray and give
 Thanks to him,* but not for all things.

Such Distinctions as these would be very
 necessary to be known, and to be observed.
 But since Christ is to be worshipped by
proper Adoration, and by *direct Invocation
 and Thanksgiving;* and since he is to be
 worshipped, not only *properly and direct-
 ly,* but in all the same *Kinds and Instances*
 of proper and direct Worship, in which the
 Father is worshipped, there is no use to be
 made of any of those *Metaphysical Distin-
 ctions* before-mentioned, whatever Truth
 there may be in them.

For,

For, if we may offer the same *Prayers* and *Thanksgivings* immediately to the *Son*, as we do to the *Father*; and if all our *Addresses* are as surely heard, and as effectually answered, by the one as by the other; It is the same thing whether the *Person* we apply to, be *unoriginated*, or *derived*; whether he be served as *Supreme*, or as *strictly and absolutely Supreme*; whether the *Honour* that is payed him be rightly termed *supreme Honour*, or *absolutely supreme Honour*; or whether our *Prayers* and *Praises* are offered *primarily* to the *Father* or to the *Son*; and whether the *Honour* we pay the *Son*, be understood as *finally and ultimately* tending to the *Honour* and *Glory* of the *Father*, or not. These are Considerations which never enter into the Mind of the *World* i per, who, having the natural Notion of *God* before him, suits his *Worship* accordingly, whatever *Person* he applies to as *God*.

Chap. II. Of the Son of God.

The Design of this whole Chapter, consisting of five Sections, is to shew, that notwithstanding *Christ is stiled God*;

That *the World was made by him*;

That *other the highest Titles, Perfections and Powers are ascribed to him*;

§. 1.

§. 2.

§. 3.

§. 4.

And notwithstanding all the *Honour and Worship that ought to be paid him*.

§. 5.

Yet he is so far *subordinate to the Father*, as not to be the same God with him, or God in the same Sense.

The whole of Dr. *Clark's* Doctrine upon this head, and whatever he says throughout his Book, either by way of *Proof*, or *Illustration*, will properly come under the Style of *Notes*, upon the two following Texts.

The first of which is this,

p. 100.

Joh. 10. 30. I and my Father are one.

Ib.

Not one and the same Person, but one and the same thing.

Ib.

Being in the Father's Hands, and being in the Son's Hands, is one and the same thing.

p. 102.

Every appearance of God the Father in the Old Testament, was Christ appearing in the Person of the Father, in the Form of God.

p. 106.

The Will of the Father is as perfectly made known by the Son, as if they both were but one and the same Person.

p. 107.

He that hath seen the Power of Christ, hath seen the Power of the Father. He that hath known the Will of Christ, hath known the Will of the Father. He that hath heard him who is the Word of God, hath heard all that can be heard of God.

p. 110.

There is so perfect an Union and Communion between the Father and the Son, that

that whosoever seeth the Son's Works, seeth the Father's Works, and whosoever heareth the Son's Words, heareth the Father's Words.

The Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, are one and the same thing, one and the same Testimony. p. 238.

The Power of the Son, is it's self the power and Authority of the Father. p. 333.

To which may be added what Mr. *Whiston* says in one of his Essays, *That all three Divine Persons, viz. Father, Son and Holy Ghost, do jointly concur in the Creation and Government of all Creatures, and that therefore taken together, they are the proper and only Maker and Governour of the World, which is a common Sense of the Word God.* Wh. Serm. & El. p. 215.

And as *Father and Son are one*, in all these Respects, there may be also (as 'tis owned by Dr. *Clark*) *some other more mysterious and incomprehensible Instances of Union and Communion between the Father and the Son, than that which the Connexion of these Words (I and my Father are one) naturally leads to; and to such this Text may have a secret Reference.* p. 101.

The meaning, therefore, of this Text may be (unless it implys a Contradiction to interpret it so) That the Father and Son are one God, one Being of the same Nature and Substance. And that the highest Instance

stance of Union possible is here meant, 'tis very reasonable to believe; because the Words are spoken by the *Son*, who, if he had been a different Being from the Father, and consequently inferiour to him, would not have expressed himself in such a manner as implied any equality, no more than *Abraham* would have called *God his Friend*, tho' God was pleased, with a mighty Condescension of Love to call him so.

And why may we not say that Father and Son are *one and the same Being*, as well as *one and the same thing*? If Christ's appearing in the Person of the Father, was the same thing as if the Father himself had appeared; if knowing the Power of the Son, be the same as knowing the Power of the Father; and knowing the Son's Will, be the same as knowing the Father's Will; if the Power of the Son be itself the Power and Authority of the Father; if the Son's Works be the Father's Works, and the Son's Words the Father's Words; and if the Will of the Father be as perfectly made known by the Son, as if they were but one and the same Person: May it not as truly be said, that to obey the Will of the Son, is to obey the Will of the Father, and to worship the Son, is the same thing as to worship the Father? And why should we then scruple to say that they are the *same God*?

That

That they are *two Gods* the Doctor positively denies: and he does at the same time, as expressly assert that *the Father is God*, and *the Son is God*, and yet, that *there is but one God*. How this can be, when Father and Son are declared to be *two different Beings*, he indeavours to shew several ways: But the plainest and most intelligible Account of his Notion we have from the following Similitudes, highly approved by him.

As a Father is Master of his own House, p. 435. *and a Son and Heir in his Father's House, of his own Building, is Master of the same House; and yet there is properly but one Master.* Because there is *but one Authority*, viz. *That of the Father exercised by the Son.* And, *as a King upon the Throne*, Ib. *and his Son administering the Father's Government*, are, for the same reason, *but one King*; so the Father is God, and the Son is God, and yet there is *but one God*; because there is *but one Divine Authority*. He does not say, *they are but one God*, as the Creed says, which these Similitudes are brought to explain; but *there is but one God*; tho', I think, both Expressions mean the same thing, whatever difference he may suppose there is between them.

But, however that be, according to this Scheme, *God* is a Word of Office only, as *Master*, and *King* is; and signifies something

thing distinct from the *Divine Nature*. And then it must be said, that, as *Father* and *Son* are *two Men*, and yet there is but *one Master*; so these *two Persons in the Trinity*, which are called *Father* and *Son*, are *two Eternal, Almighty, Omniscient Beings*, or *Substances*, and yet, that there is but *one God*; that is, *one Master or King*, with Relation to all Mankind.

But, if the Word *God* signifies the *Divine Nature*, as the Word *Man* signifies the *Human Nature*; then *two Eternal, Almighty and Omniscient Beings* are as truly *two Gods*; as *two finite Beings*, each of them consisting of a reasonable Soul and a Body, are *two Men*.

And this Inference will hold as well, if the Son be allowed to be *subordinate* to the Father, as if they were both of *coordinate Divinity*. Thus *Father* and *Son* are as much *Two Men*, as *Two Brothers* are *Two Men*; neither *Generation*, nor *Subordination*, altering any thing in the *Human Nature*, 'tho it may create a difference of *Dignity*, or *Order*, in the Execution of the same *Office*.

But, farther, whatever Difference we suppose in the *Persons* exercising *Divine Authority*, if the *Authority* be the same, the same *Honour* and *Worship* is due to both. If therefore the *Authority* of the Son be as great and extensive, as uncontrollable

able, and irresistible, as that of the Father; (and if it be the same to be sure it is) then the same Obedience is due to it; and the same Honour is to be paid to the Person, by whom it is exercised.

Thus it appears from the Doctor's own Explications of this famous Passage in St. John, ----- *My Father and I are one*, that the Father and Son are one God. But, before I dismiss this Text, it will not be amiss to consider his Criticism upon the word *One*. viz. not [*εἰς unus*] *one and the same Person*, but [*ἐν unum*] *one and the same thing*. p. 100.

Upon this nicety he seems to lay a great stress; but whether [*ἐν*] may not here signify the same as [*εἰς*] viz. *one and the same God*, or, in his Sense of the Word Person, *one and the same Person*, that is, *one and the same Being*, is a Question that he will be better able to decide, when he has considered those other Expressions in St. Matthew and St. Luke. viz. (a) τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν, (a) Mat. I. 20. (b) τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον, together with his own (b) Luk. I. 35. Translation of a Passage in Origen, viz. οὐκ ἔστι δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πρᾶγματα, which is rendered thus, *being in subsistence two real distinct Persons*: For, if τὸ γεννηθὲν in St. Matthew, and τὸ ἅγιον in St. Luke, signify the same as ὁ γεννηθεὶς & ὁ ἅγιος, *that Person or Being which shall be born, and that Holy Person* p. 108.

Person or Being; and *δύο ὑπόστασις*, in Origen, may be rendred *two real and distinct Persons or Beings*; why may not the Word *ἐν*, in the Passage of St. John before quoted, mean *one and the same Being*, as well as *one and the same Thing*?

I shall now consider that other Text principally insisted upon in this Dispute.

p. 157.

Job. 14. 28. My Father is greater than I.

That Christ should speak this as *Man* only, is no such absurd or improper Exposition of this place, as Doctor Clark seems to think: As will appear not only from these Texts, *viz. God is greater than Man, Job 33. 12.* and, --- *He that is higher than the Highest regardeth, and there be higher than they, Eccl. 5. 8.* But from the whole Tendency of our Saviour's Discourse with his Disciples in this Chapter. For in the former part of it, he had given them many Indications of his own Greatness and Power, and Union with the Father, and yet they were not capable of taking them; nor could any thing of this Nature remove the Trouble and Concern they were under upon the Account of his intended Departure from them; for which, no other reason can be given, but that they still looked upon him as mere Man, and therefore, not able to help and assist them when absent, notwithstanding all the mighty Works he had done, and

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity.

III

and could still do upon Earth. When he tells them of going to prepare a place for them in his Father's House, Thomas saith unto him, Lord, we know not whether thou goest: When he upbraids them for their Ignorance, in not knowing the Father, tho' they had known him and seen him; Philip saith unto him, Lord, shew us the Father. When he promised that he would love them who loved him and would manifest himself unto them; Judas saith unto him, how is it that thou wilt manifest thy self to us, and not unto the World? Thus we see, that whatever he said to them, concerning his own future Power and Glory, still they were dull of Understanding, and did not know how those things could be; and still their Heart was troubled, and was afraid, by reason of his leaving them; and therefore he adds this in the last place, by way of Comfort to them, tho' I go away, you ought not to be troubled, but rather rejoice, because I go unto the Father: For my Father is greater than I: As if he had said, tho' you still distrust my Power when I am gone from you, as esteeming me only a Man, yet, the Father, to whom I go, is greater than I; him you allow to be a God afar off, as well as a God at hand; and therefore you may safely depend upon his Protection and Ability to save you. Thus our Saviour seems

Ch. 14.
 §. 15.
 ch. 15. ib.
 §. 29.

seems to have accommodated his Discourse to the present Apprehensions which his Disciples had concerning him: Tho' (as he plainly intimates in this and the following Chapter) they would believe greater things of him, and have greater Confidence in him hereafter, when *the Comforter, the Spirit of Truth should come, and testify of him;* for, *at that day*, he tells them, *they should know* what they could not now comprehend, *that he was in the Father.*

But supposing this Text to be understood of *Christ as God*; why may not then the former Text be understood in like manner of *the Divine Nature*? Why is it not as easy to conceive, that when Christ says, *the Father and I are one*, the meaning should be that *Father and Son are one God, one Being of the same Nature and Substance*; as when the Son says, *the Father is greater than I*, he should mean that *the Father is a greater God than the Son*; especially, considering that this Interpretation seems to make the Father and Son *two Gods*, whereas, the other Text plainly establishes *the unity of God*? It must therefore be allowed, that the *first* Text favours the *Orthodox Doctrine*, at least as much, if not more than the *latter* makes for the *Arian Scheme*. And as to any *pre-eminence* of the *Father*, consistent with his being the *same God* with the

the Son; that is fully owned and acknowledged by *the Orthodox*, most of whom say that the Father *as God*, is *greater* than the Son, tho' at the same time, they say, 'tis only as he is, *God the Father*, not as *God absolutely*.

It is likewise farther to be observed upon this Head, that this *latter* Text may be understood of Christ as *Man*, and the *former* cannot, it being always brought to prove, even by the *Arians* themselves, that *Christ is God*.

Many more Remarks of the like kind, might be made upon Dr. *Clark's* manner of explaining Texts, so as to favour his own Scheme; but, since the truest way of understanding the meaning of *single Texts* relating to the present Controversy, is (as he himself observes) to consider them *all* together *in one view*; I have, for a farther ^{Introd. P. 17.} Proof of what appears to me to be the true *Scripture-Doctrine*, concerning the *Divinity of the Son of God*, added the two following Collections.

Some Passages of Scripture in which the Father and Son are mentioned together, in such a manner as to imply their *Equality* or *Unity*.

I

Mat.

Mat. 28. 29. Baptizing * in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Joh. 5. 17. My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.

23. That all Men should honour the Son as they honour the Father.

12. 45. He that seeth me, seeth him that sent me.

14. 1. Ye believe in God; believe also in me.

7. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also.

17. 3. This is Life Eternal, that they might know thee the only true God,

* That is, says Dr. Clark, *In the Name of the Father, who originally gave that Power, [mentioned γ . 18.] in the Name of the Son, to whom that Power is given; and in the Name of the Holy Ghost, by whom that Power is exercised, p. 229.* But there seems to be no ground at all from the Text for this Explication: For when Christ says that *all Power was given unto him in Heaven, and in Earth, γ . 18.* He says this, only to satisfy his Apostles, that he had full Authority to send them into the World to preach the Gospel. *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, Baptizing them—or [and Baptize them] γ . 19.* So that the Power given to Christ, γ . 18. has no manner of Reference to the Form of Baptism prescribed, γ . 19. but only to the Commission there given by Christ to his Apostles.

This being then the *most ancient* Form of Baptism, it must not be explained as the latter Doxology is, which Dr. Clark says, ought thus to be expressed, *Glory be to the Father, with or by the Son, in the Holy Ghost.* And since the Word *And*, is not allowed to stand in our Doxologies, for fear it should infer *Equality*: We may well suppose it to infer some *Equality* or *Unity* in the Form of Baptism, where it stands unalterably.

and

and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

Acts 8. 12. — Preaching the Things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ.

20. 21. Testifying — Repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.

Rom. 1. 1. Paul a Servant of Jesus Christ, separated unto the Gospel of God.

7. Grace to you, and Peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

The same Form of Salvation recurs, *1 Cor.* 1. 3. *2 Cor.* 1. 2. *Gal.* 1. 3. *Eph.* 1. 2. *Phil.* 1. 2. *Col.* 1. 2. *1 Thes.* 1. 1. *2 Thes.* 1. 2. *Philem.* 3.

8. 9. Ye are not in the Flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any Man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.

1 Cor. 9. 21. Being not without Law to God, but under the Law to Christ.

2 Cor. 10. 5. Casting down Imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth it self against the Knowledge of God, and bringing into Captivity every thought, to the obedience of Christ.

12. 19. We speak before God in Christ.

13. 14. The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.

Gal. 1. 1. Paul an Apostle, not of Men, neither by Man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father.

Eph. 5. 5. No Whoremonger, nor unclean Person, nor covetous Man, --- hath any inheritance in the Kingdom of Christ and of God.

6 23. Peace be to the Brethren, and Love, with Faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

Phil. 3. 3. --- Which worship God in the Spirit, and rejoyce in Christ Jesus.

Col. 2. 2. --- To the Acknowledgment of the Mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ.

3. 3. --- Your Life is hid with Christ in God.

1 Thes. 1. 1. ----- Unto the Church of the Thessalonians, which is in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus Christ.

3. 11. Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you.

5. 18. In every thing give thanks: For this is the Will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you.

2 Thes. 1. 1. --- The Church of the Thessalonians in God our Father, and in the Lord Jesus Christ.

8. --- Taking Vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

12. According to the Grace of our God, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

2. 14. —Whereunto he [*God*] called you, ---to the obtaining of the Glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

16. 17. Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God even our Father; ---Comfort your Hearts, and stablish you in every good Word and Work.

3. 5. The Lord direct your Hearts into the Love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ.

1 *Tim.* 1. 1. Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the Commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ, which is our Hope.

2. Grace, Mercy and Peace from God our Father, and Jesus Christ our Lord.

5. 21. I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

6. 13. I give thee charge in the sight of God, and before Christ Jesus.

2 *Tim.* 1. 2. Grace, Mercy, and Peace, from God the Father, and Christ Jesus our Lord.

4. 1. I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the Quick and the Dead, at his appearing, and his Kingdom.

Tit. 1. 1. Paul a Servant of God, and an Apostle of Jesus Christ.

2. Grace, Mercy and Peace, from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ our Saviour.

2. 13. Looking for that blessed Hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Jam. 1. 1. James, a Servant of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ.

2 *Pet.* 1. 1. — Through the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ,

2. Grace, and Peace be multiplied unto you, through the Knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord.

1 *John* 5. 7. There are three that bear Record in Heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.

2 *Joh.* 3. Grace be with you, Mercy and Peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in Truth, and Love.

9. Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the Doctrine of Christ, hath not God: He that abideth in the Doctrine of Christ, hath both the Father and the Son.

Jude 1. — To them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called—

4. Denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

21. Keep your selves in the Love of God, looking for the Mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, unto Eternal Life.

Rev.

Rev. 1. 2. Who bare record of the Word of God, and of the Testimony of Jesus Christ.

9. I John --- was in the Isle that is called Patmos, for the Word of God, and for the Testimony of Jesus Christ.

5. 13. Blessing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power, be unto him that sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.

6. 16. Hide us from the Face of him that sitteth on the Throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb.

7. 10. Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb.

11. 15. The Kingdoms of this World are become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever.

12. 10. --- Now is come Salvation and Strength, and the Kingdom of our God, and the Power of his Christ.

14. 4. These were redeemed from among Men, being the First-fruits unto God, and to the Lamb.

12. Here are they that keep the Commandments of God, and the Faith of Jesus.

20. 4. I saw the Souls of them that were beheaded for the Witness of Jesus, and for the Word of God.

6. --- They shall be Priests of God, and of Christ.

21. 22. I saw no Temple therein :
For the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb,
are the Temple of it.

23. The City had no need of the
Sun: For the Glory of God did lighten it,
and the Lamb is the Light thereof.

12. 1. ---Proceeding out of the
Throne of God, and of the Lamb.

3. The Throne of God, and of the
Lamb, shall be in it; and his Servants shall
serve him.

Intr.

P. 17.

Now the Doctrine which, *upon the most
careful consideration of the whole matter,
appears to me to be fully contained in these
Texts* is, that Christ is God, in the *true,
common, absolute* Sense of the Word; and
that we ought to *honour the Son, even as
we honour the Father.*

Some Passages of Scripture, where Do-
ctor Clark says, it is ambiguous whether
Father or *Son* be meant.

Luke 1. 16. Many of the Children of Is-
rael shall he [John the Baptist] turn to *the
Lord their God.*

Acts 1. 24. They prayed and said; *thou
Lord* which knowest the Hearts of all
Men.

2 *Cor.* 12. 8. For this thing I besought
the *Lord* thrice, that it might depart from
me.

Gat.

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity. 121

Gal. 1. 5. — To *whom* be Glory for ever and ever, Amen.

Eph. 1. 14. — Unto the Praise of *his* Glory.

3. 15. Of *whom*, the whole Family in Heaven and Earth is named.

5. 19. Singing and making Melody in your Heart to *the Lord*,

Col. 2. 3. In *whom* are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge.

3. 16. — Singing with Grace in your Hearts to *the Lord*.

1 Thes. 3. 12. *The Lord* make you to increase and abound in Love one towards another.

5. 27. I charge you by *the Lord*, that this Epistle be read. —

2 Thess. 3. 16. *The Lord of Peace*, himself give you Peace always, by all means. *The Lord* be with you all.

2 Tim. 4. 17, 18. *The Lord* stood with me and strengthened me, — And *the Lord* shall deliver me from every evil Work, and will preserve me unto *his* heavenly Kingdom: To *whom* be Glory for ever and ever, Amen.

Tit. 2. 13. — The glorious appearing of *the Great God*.

Heb. 13. 21. — To *whom* be Glory for ever and ever, Amen.

1 Pet. 4. 11. — To *whom* be Praise and Dominion for ever and ever, Amen.

1 Job.

1 *Job*. 5. 14. This is the Confidence that we have in *him*, that if we ask any thing according to *his* will, *He* heareth us.

Whoever reads these Texts, will immediately conclude that the *God* and *Lord*, here mentioned, is the one supreme God, the God of Heaven and Earth, the God and Lord, whom we Christians are to adore; without considering whether they refer more properly to *the Son*, or to *the Father*. As to many of them, it *seems most natural* (as Dr. Clark himself owns) that *the Words should be understood of Christ*, v. n. 534, 634, 690, 706, 725, 726, 738. But if it be only doubtful or *ambiguous* whether the *Father* or *Son* be meant in these Passages, this is a very good Argument, that it is all one of which they are understood.

The whole state of this Controversy concerning the *Divinity* of our Saviour, is in short this,

There are many Passages in Scripture, which represent *Christ* only as *Man*, there are many Texts, from which 'tis plainly concluded, that he was *more than Man*, tho' these alone are not sufficient to prove him God; and there are many other Texts which shew him to be *truly God*.

Should a Collection of Passages under each of these three Heads be made; whoever

ever considered them separately, must own this to be true, according to the plain literal interpretation of the Words, without any reasoning upon them. The only Question therefore is, upon a fair Comparison of all these Texts together, which of the three Opinions, suggested from each Collection, should take place.

That those Passages of Scripture which establish the *Divinity of Christ*, should be the strongest, and have most weight with us, seems to me very plain: Because this Opinion takes in the other two, and reconciles all the Texts in the proper Sense of them, without reasoning, or drawing any Consequences from them, which no other Doctrine does.

It is allowed by the *Orthodox*, that all the Texts brought to prove Christ to be *Man*, are rightly urged for that Purpose: But, they say, it cannot be concluded from hence, that he is *only Man*: This is an inference which the *Socinians* make, but nowhere occurs in Scripture.

So in like manner it is granted that all the Texts which we suppose collected under the second Head, do prove Christ to be *more than Man*, to be a Being of much higher Perfections than are known to belong to Man. But it does not therefore follow, that he is not *truly God*, any more than it follows from all the Texts brought

to prove his *Humanity*, that he is *meer Man*; this Inference of the *Arians* is of their own making, without any Foundation in Scripture for it.

But when we consider those Texts by themselves, which the Orthodox alledge for the Proof of *Christ's Divinity*; we yield to them in the plain obvious Sense they bear, without drawing any Conclusion of our own from them.

Neither, indeed, can any Conclusion be made by us, which is inconsistent with the meaning of all the former Passages. For we grant Christ to be *as truly Man* as the *Socinians* do; and we own him to be a Being *as much exceeding Man* as the *Arians*. We say that Christ took upon him *true Flesh*; that he appeared for some time as *Man only*; that he discovered his *Divinity* to the World by degrees; but, that at last, *God* was fully *manifest in the Flesh*. And this we affirm, was very agreeable to the Conduct of God in all his Dispensations, with regard to Man, to reveal himself to them in a manner adapted to their Capacities, and in such Measure and Proportion as they were able to bear, which is a Principle that both *Socinians* and *Arians* do also allow.

What is then to be said, in answer to all the Texts which prove the *Divinity of Christ*?

Tho

The substance of what the *Socinians* advance, is this, that there is no other *God*, meant in the Scriptures, but the *one supreme God*; that wherever any mention is made of any of the *Divine Attributes*, they are the Attributes of this *one God*; and that all such *Works* as are any where in the Sacred Writings ascribed to God, can be ascribed to no other Being, but this *one supreme God*, to whom belongs every thing which we attribute to *Christ as God*. All the Texts therefore, which we bring to prove the *Divinity of Christ*, are, indeed, (as they allow) Arguments of a *true and proper Divinity*, but as residing in the Father only, and not communicated to the Son, but only manifested in and by the Son. If, therefore, Christ be God at all, he must be the *same God with the Father*, according to the *Socinians*.

The *Arians* on the contrary, besides the Texts peculiar to their own Hypothesis, make use of the same Texts that we do, to prove what they call the *Divinity of Christ*: They do in like manner conclude from hence, that he is *truly and properly God*, and that he is to be *directly worshipped as God*, with all Kinds of proper Worship and Honour: But then they say that the Word *God* is an *equivocal Word*, which is applied to the Father and Son in different Senses; and that the Worship due to the Son,

Son, tho' of the same kind with that which is paid to the Father, is to be paid to the Father in a higher manner, and more eminent Degree than to the Son.

Now, the *Orthodox* do so far agree with the *Socinians*, as to understand the Word *God* always in the same Sense: But, then they say with the *Arians*, that *Father and Son* are *two Persons*, each of which is *truly God*. But that the Father and Son should be *two different Beings*; that there should be two different Beings, each of which is God, and yet that there should be but *one God*; that we should be obliged to *worship the one God and him only*, and yet that worship should be due to *another Being*, besides this *one God*: These are Propositions which are no where to be found in Scripture; and we can perceive no ground from thence to draw such Conclusions. This is all Philosophy and Humane reasoning.

And if the Dispute be put upon this Foot, then the Case stands thus.

All the Reasonings made use of both by the *Arians* and the *Orthodox* upon this head, are chiefly founded upon the Relation of *Father and Son*.

As among Men, *Father and Son* are *two distinct Beings*, and the *Son* is *subordinate and inferiour* to the *Father*: From hence the *Arians* argue (and so does Dr. Clark seem to do) that God the Father, and God
the

the Son, must be likewise *two distinct Beings*, and the Son of God must be in the same manner *subordinate and inferiour* to his Father.

The *Orthodox*, on the contrary, reason thus. As among Men, *Father and Son* have the same Nature, and the same Perfections; so the Son of God must have the same Divine Nature and Perfections that God the Father hath. But as Man, who is a temporary Being, begets a Son, who is also a Temporary Being, of like Duration with himself; so God who is an *Eternal Being* must have an *Eternal Son*. But, tho' two Men are individually distinct from one another, because they are *finite Beings*, who have a *separate Existence*; yet there cannot be two *eternal Beings*, *separately existing* from one another, and therefore they say,

That God hath begotten a Son of the same Nature with himself, not only specifically, but individually: So that, he that begetteth is God, and he which is begotten is the same God. Pearson upon the Creed, P. 33.

But then they allow also, that in the very name of Father, there is something of *Eminence*, which is not in that of Son, and some kind of *Priority* in him whom we call the first, in respect of him, whom we term the second Person. Which Priority consisteth not in this, that the *Essence or Attributes*

butes of the one, are greater than the Essence or Attributes of the other; For,— They are the same in both: But only in this, that the Father hath that Essence of himself, the Son by communication from the Father.

As therefore, we argue from the Notion of *Father and Son*, that the Son of God must have the *same Nature* with God the Father; so we allow of any such *subordination* or *inferiority* in the Son, as is implied in that Relation, and is consistent with his being the *same God* with the Father.

This is the substance of the Controversy, concerning the *Divinity of the Son of God*. And with relation to the whole Trinity, all our Reasonings may be reduced to as narrow a Compals.

Cl. Intro.
p. 26.

As to what is *properly Theological in this matter*; viz. *The distinct Powers and Offices of the three Persons in the Creation, Government, Redemption, and Sanctification of Man*: In these things the *Orthodox* agree with Dr. Clark, and with Mr. Whiston, and with all that allow of a *Trinity of Persons* in any Sense. And, indeed, there cannot well be any danger of mistaking the *personal Distinctions* made use of in Scripture, they are so plainly laid down, and so frequently repeated.

1b.

Neither is there any difference between us, concerning the *proper Honour due from Men*

Men to each of these Persons distinctly, so far as we take Scripture for our Guide, because all the Forms of speaking used upon this Account in Scripture, are transcribed into our Publick Devotions; as appears plainly from Dr. Clark's Collection of *Pas-* sages, out of our Liturgy in the Third part of his Book. S. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

The whole Dispute then between us and Dr. Clark, Mr. Whiston, &c. is, concerning the Metaphysical Nature and Substance of each of the three Persons in the ever blessed Trinity; which things (says Dr. Clark) had they never been meddled with, the Peace of the Catholick Church, and the simplicity of the Christian Faith, had possibly never been disturbed. Introduct. P. 26. Ib.

I am of the same Opinion, that scholastic and philosophical Inquiries concerning these things, ought, as much as may be, to be avoided. But, certainly, Dr. Clark, and Mr. Whiston, have no right to inveigh against the Use of Philosophy and Human Reasoning in these Matters, whose Hypotheses, (as they appear to me) are intirely Philosophical, and very much out of the common way of reasoning. Ib.

That Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are not three Names only, we all agree: But that they should be three different Beings, I can no ways comprehend.

There may, indeed, be *Three Beings* of different Attributes and Perfections, to whom the Word *God*, may, in some sense or other, be applied. But, if each of these be *truly God*; with what Reason, or Propriety of Speech it can be said that there is but *one God*, I do not understand. In the *Heathen Theology*, the Word *God* was applied very differently; but, whatever difference there were in the *Order, Authority, Power*, or other Attributes of those Beings which the Heathen worshipped, they always reckoned as many *Gods* as there were Beings called by that Name. And why the same Language is not as proper in the *Christian Religion*, upon the supposition that *Son* and *Spirit* are *created Beings*, each of which is *truly God*, and the *proper Object* of Human *Worship*, no good reason can be assigned.

As to the Notion of *three eternal Beings*; it seems to me utterly impossible: And whoever affirms that there are three eternal Beings, who have *one and the same Power and Authority*, or (as 'tis otherwise expressed) *one and the same Divinity*, whatever way he takes to explain himself, does in effect say that there is but *one eternal Being*. And this is the result of all Dr. Clark's Propositions at the last. For, in the third part of his Book, he openly declares that in the Blessed Trinity, there are not *three eter-*

nal Beings [Persons] but one eternal Being [Person] tho' each of the three Beings, p. 434. [Persons] is eternal, in his Sense, viz. The p. 431. Father eternal of himself, the Son [and Spirit] eternal, as having always been with the Father. This is plainly his Doctrine, understanding all along, intelligent Being and Person, as equivalent Terms, as he assures us they are, tho' he oftentimes uses the Word Person, as if they were not. But how Father, Son, and Holy Ghost can be three Beings, each of which is eternal; and yet, that there should be but one eternal Being, Doctor Clark has not been able to unfold to us. For the Distinctions of original and de-rived, make no manner of difference in our Notion of Eternity; because a Being eternally derived, is as much an eternal Being, as a Being which is eternal of himself. To assert, therefore, that there are three eternal Beings, and but one God, is a sort of Sabellianism reversed, it being all one as to say, that there are three Beings who have one Name, sustain one Character, and exercise one Office; which is a Notion much like that of one Being, having three Denominations, sustaining three Characters, and exercising three Offices; that is, three Men may be one King, Just as one Man may be King, Priest, and Prophet.

But, if it be possible that there should be *three eternal Beings*, they must needs be *three Gods*; as has been learnedly proved by a great Master of Reasoning and Language in his Answers to Dr. *Sherlock*; and therefore I shall enter no farther into that Argument.

Nothing then remains, but what the *Orthodox* say, that *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, have, each of them, the *same Divine Nature* whole and undivided, but after a *different manner*, the Father *Originally*, the Son by *Communication from the Father*, the Holy Ghost, by *Communication from the Father and the Son*. How there can be such a *Communication* of the Divine Nature, or such *Emanations* from the original Fountain, I am not able to comprehend; but, if it be not impossible, if it do not imply a Contradiction, (as I am confident it does not) this Doctrine must be true, as having a plainer Foundation in Scripture than any other: Because we have but one easy Notion of *God*, exhibited to us in the Sacred Writings, and many positive Precepts to serve this one God, and no other. And, therefore, since the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, are in the same Scriptures represented each of them as God, and proposed to us as the Object of Worship; however they may be *distinguished* from, or *subordinate* to the *Father*, there can be no other *distinction*

distinction or subordination, but what is consistent with the *Unity of God*.

Laying aside, then, all Inquiries into the *metaphysical Nature of the three Persons*; I am content, at last, to abide by Mr *Whiston's* Notion of the *Trinity*, viz. That *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, taken together, are the PROPER and ONLY MAKER and GOVERNOR of the World*. For *God our Maker, our Creator and Governour*, is a Style that includes in it every thing that belongs to God, every thing that infers *Divine Perfection, or Humane Obligation*. If *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, taken together, are the Creatour and Governour of the World*; then it follows, that *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, taken together, are that eternal Being, of infinite Perfections, who could, and did, create the World, and who are jointly the Object of Human Worship*.

Serm. &
Efl. p. 215.

Maker and Governour of the World, is, ^{Ib.} indeed (as Mr. *Whiston* observes) a *common Sense of the Word God*; but the common Sense is certainly the truest, or else there must be one God for the *Learned*, another for the *People*: And if so, I desire to serve God with the *People*, who have all the same simple uniform Notion of *God*; and as to the distinction of *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, they say, and understand alike with the *Learned*, that these are not meer *Names of God*, but import some

greater distinction, as great as is consistent with *the Unity of God*; but such as they are not able to explain or conceive.

This, I think, is the utmost that we are capable of knowing, concerning *the Trinity*. And, as to any *unscriptural Expressions* made use of for the Explication of this Doctrine, they may, perhaps, in some Respects be improper; and they ought, as much as may be, to be avoided. But, if this be all that Dr. *Clark* aims at; if this be the whole Design of his Performance, to reduce the Doctrine of the Trinity within the Bounds of Scripture; and to *hold every body strictly to this Rule*, so as not to allow them to *add any Words or Expressions of their own*, or to *draw any remote Consequences from those of Scripture*; why does he himself lay down such Propositions, and use such Terms, and Forms of speaking as are nowhere to be found in the Sacred Writings?

Should we confine our selves wholly to *the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles*, so far as it is *declared necessary in their own express Words*; then we ought not to say,

Par. 2. §. 2. that *the Son is a second divine Person*,
 §. 3. and the Holy Ghost, *a third divine Person* in the ever blessed *Trinity*; that the
 §. 55. Father, or *first Person* is *the Author* and
 §. 6. *Principle* of whatsoever is done by the Son and the Spirit; that the Son and Spirit *de-*
rive

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity. 135

rive their Being and Essence, and all their §. 12.
Attributes from the Father, as from the Su- §. 19.
preme Cause; that the Father alone is be- §. 5.
gotten of none; that the Son and Spirit are §. 34.
subordinate to the Father; that there is but §. 40.
one God, because in the Monarchy of the §. 39.
Universe, there is but one Authority, Ori- §. 38.
ginal in the Father, derivative in the Son;
that the Divinity of the Son was perso-
nally united to it [Flesh only]; that the
Son, before his Incarnation, appeared on- §. 48.
ly as the [Shedinah, or] Habitation of the
Glory of the Father, in which the Name
of God was; that the Son derives his Be-
ing from the Father, by his eternal Power p. 431.
and Will; or, by the Power of his Will,
not necessity of Nature; that Christ knows §. 17.
our Hearts, by the Will of the Father who p. 280.
communicates to him all Knowledge in an p. 316.
ineffable manner. These, and other Ex-
pressions of the like nature, together with
the following Distinctions, between him who p. 3.
is strictly and properly God; in the highest, §. 7.
strict and proper Sense, absolutely supreme
over all; absolutely speaking, God of the §. 8.
Universe; and him who is God over all,
in some other Sense: Between Divine Ho- §. 43.
nour, absolutely supreme, and that which
is not absolutely supreme; worshipping the
Son in his own Person, and worshipping §. 48.
him in the Person of the Father; Prayers p. 102.
offered to the Son, but ultimately directed p. 362.

to God, only as our Father, and Prayers offered to the Son as our Lawgiver, our King, our Judge, and our God, without such direction, &c. All such Expressions, I say, and Distinctions as these, which are frequently repeated and insisted upon by Dr. Clark, as necessary for the right understanding the Doctrine of the Trinity, are equally unscriptural with those made use of by the Church, as many of them are also contrary to them. And therefore, 'tis plain, that Dr. Clark's *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, is not the *Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles*, declared necessary in their own Words.

And that it is not proved to be so by immediate, obvious, indisputable; and (to every sincere Reader of Scripture) evident Consequence there-from, I have endeavour'd to shew in the former Discourse; and many others have fully and effectually proved before me; from whose learned Inquiries it appears, that most of the skilful as well as sincere Readers of Scripture, in all Ages, have drawn different Consequences from Scripture than Dr. Clark has done; and have thought them as obvious, evident and indisputable as he thinks his to be. And this hath likewise been farther made out

D. lately by a * very able hand.

But, waving this Plea of Recrimination by which Dr. Clark appears to be self-condemned

* Scip.
of Tr.
Vind.

Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity. 437

condemned for using *unscriptural Expressions*, and those too of *difficult and dubious meaning*, at the same time that he condemns *those in Power in the Church*, for introducing the like *unscriptural Expressions* into the publick Forms of Faith and Worship; it may be farther offered in justification of the Governours of the Church in this respect, that they were not only provoked, but even constrained to exercise their Authority in this manner, by the dangerous and ungovernable Zeal of Hereticks, in propagating false or unnecessary Doctrines, and using many new and improper Expressions for the defence of them, contrary to those *indisputable Forms and Professions of Faith*, which were received unanimously in the Primitive Church, and which confessedly contain all that is explicitly necessary to the Baptism, Absolution, and Salvation of a Christian. This hath been the true Cause and Occasion of all the additional Terms and Expressions complained of by Dr. Clark, and Mr. Whiston; and had it not been for the great Contentions and Disturbances raised in the Church, by the Arians of the fourth Century, neither the Nicene, nor Athanasian Creed, which give them such Offence, had now made any part either of our Liturgy or Articles.

As to the Method proposed by Dr. Clark, of condemning and forbidding the use of such
unscrip-

P. 471.

Ib.

P. 446.

P. 470.

unscriptural Expressions as at any time give offence to the Church, and requiring Men to forbear the use of them. I must confess it was always my Opinion that this was the most proper Method of suppressing Heresies, and generally speaking, the most effectual too: But, as to the present Controversy, the Complaint against those in Power, for not contenting themselves with taking this way only, to suppress the *Arian Heresy*, but injoining the use of positive Terms, in the established Forms of Faith, is so ill grounded; that I am now very much disposed to judge that this *Latter* way is not only justifiable, but in some cases necessary, in order to guard and secure the true Faith. For if these Expressions, which 'tis granted the *Arians* first presumed to introduce [viz. *ὁ υἱος οὐκ ὄντος ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς*, and *ἐξ οὗ οὐκ ὄντος* *ἡν*] are unjustifiable Phrases, and those that use them, worthy of Censure; (as Dr. Clark declares) and if they are rash and novel Expressions, which ought to have been condemned by the Church; (as Mr. Whiston owns) why may we not as well use these positive Expressions [viz. *that the Son is eternal, and of the same Substance with the Father*] as condemn the other, when, if the former be false (and if they are not, they should not be condemned) the latter must needs be true, as being directly contradictory to them: If they have been justly censured,

p. 470.

Part 2.

§. 14.

2 App. H.

pref. p. 12.

Part 2.

§. 16.

censured, who presumed to affirm that there was a time when the Son was not; we may be justly allowed to affirm, that there was no time when he was not, which is the same thing as to say, that he is eternal: And, if he was not made out of nothing, and yet existed before all things, except the Father, (as the *Arians* all readily grant) he must needs be of the same Substance with the Father; there being but one eternal Substance, either supposed by the *Arians*, or possible in itself.

§. 14.

But, if it be objected, that none of these or the like Expressions ought to be used; because the Son derives his Being, and incomprehensible Power, and Knowledge, and other divine Attributes and Authority from the Father, in a manner not revealed, and which human Wisdom ought not to presume to be able to explain; to this it may be answered,

p. 86.

First, That we may as well presume to say that Christ is, by an ineffable Communication of the Divine Nature, God; as that he is by an ineffable Communication of Divine Powers and Dignity, God. How the Divine Nature is communicated, we do not pretend to understand: But a Communication of Divine Powers [or Attributes] and Dignity, without a Communication of the Divine Nature, is a Notion, that we think

p. 466.

think we do understand so far as to perceive it to be absurd: As absurd as that which supposes that *the Powers of thinking and acting* may be communicated to *matter*, without any *Mind or thinking Substance*; or that the Picture or Image of a Man may have all the *Powers and Faculties of a Man* imparted to it, without *the Human Nature*.

Secondly, It may be farther and more directly said, in answer to the Objection before mentioned, that tho' we ought not to presume to explain *in what manner* Christ derived his Being, Power, Knowledge, and other Attributes, and Authority from the Father; yet we ought to explain *what Being* he derived, whether *the same or another*; whether *Eternal or Temporary*; as also *what Power and Knowledge*, and *what other Divine Attributes and Authority*: At least, We ought to know whether his Power and Knowledge be *infinite or limited*; so likewise, as to his Authority, whether it be *full and absolute*, or *restrained*; and if restrained, *how far* it reaches; whether he hath Authority to forgive Sins, to bestow Eternal Life, inflict Eternal Death, &c. These things, I say, are necessary to be known, in order to our judging *what Honour or Worship* we ought to pay him, how far we are to serve him, and what we are

are to expect from him: That is, in short, that we ought to be fully satisfied whether he be God or not. For, If we believe Christ to be *truly God*, we must conclude that his *Authority* over us is *Absolute*, his *Power*, *Knowledge*, and other *Divine Attributes*, *Infinite*, his *Being Eternal*, and consequently *the same with the Fathers*; And therefore, that we ought to *Honour the Son as we Honour the Father*.

This is then the true *Scripture-Doctrine* concerning the *Divinity* of Christ, that he is *the same God with the Father*; which is a plain Proposition, not imbarassed with any Expressions of *difficult and dubious meaning*: and the Argument by which it is proved is as *obvious*, viz. That *there is but one God*, and he *only is to be worshipped and served*, the evident consequence from which *Words of Scripture* is, that the *Father and Son are the same God*: For, there is no other Notion of *the true God* given us in Scripture, and no other object of Human Worship there proposed to us, but that of an *Eternal Being of Infinite Knowledge and Power*, and of *absolute Authority* over us; and we have neither Precept nor Example to warrant us in the paying any kind or degree of *Worship*, or *Honour*, upon a *Religious Account*, to any other Being whatsoever.

This

This is the Argument that I have chiefly insisted upon, without using any unscriptural Expressions to explain or support it; and as to such as have been used before by the Governours of the Church; it may be fairly asserted, not only that they are *justifiable*, as opposed to other *unscriptural Expressions*, introduced by *Hereticks*; but that they are in some respect *necessary* for the *suppressing Heresies* (if they are fit to be suppressed at all) because *Hereticks* will not be kept within the *Rule of Scripture* by a bare *Condemnation* of their Opinions, but will continue to use such *unscriptural Expressions* as are brought for the Defence of their Errors, notwithstanding their being *required by those in Power to forbear the use of them*. If Dr. Clark be of another Opinion, I wish for our Conviction, this Method were now taken; and then, if all that oppose the established Faith, would readily comply with the Injunctions of their Superiours in this Case, by laying aside all such Terms and Expressions as *give Offence to the Church*; they would by this means be more likely to induce *those in Power to content themselves with the Forms and Professions of Faith, unanimously received in the primitive Church*: But multiplying *new Errors*, and reviving *old Heresies*, is not the way to bring us back to that *Antient*

cient Simplicity and Plainness so much admired, and so earnestly wished for by all Good Christians.

p. 461.

But to shew how groundless and unreasonable all the Doctors Complaints against the Church upon this Head are, I shall reduce the whole Controversy, concerning the Trinity, to this short Issue.

The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. Thus far Doctor Clark and the Church agree.

That *they are not three Gods*, Doctor Clark will readily grant; what the Church affirms, is, that *they are one God*; which I look upon to be the same thing as to say, that *they are not three*.

All that the Church requires of us farther, is to believe *this Trinity in Unity, without confounding the Persons, or Dividing the Substance*; which are purely negative Expressions importing a condemnation of certain *Heretical* Opinions, according to the Method proposed by Dr. Clark for the *Suppression of Heresy*.

This is then the Sum and Substance of all that is contained in our *Creeds, Articles, and Liturgy*, relating to the *Doctrine of the Trinity*; and whoever heartily subscribes to so much, will not find Fault with any other additional Explications, which are all resolvable into this brief Summary:
And,

10479

And, if this be agreeable to the Doctrine
of Scripture (as I am fully persuaded it is)
then the Church hath delivered nothing con-
cerning this Doctrine in her Creed, Articles,
and Liturgy, but what may be proved by
most certain Warrants of Holy Scrip-
ture.

duce the whole Conviction, con-
cerning the Trinity, to this short Illu-
stration. The Father is God, the Son is God, and
the Holy Ghost is God. Thus in Doctor
Clark and the Church.

Clark will readily grant, whatever the Church
affirms, is, that they are one God; which
I look upon to be the same thing as to say,
that they are not three.

All that the Church hath said of us further.

Page 3. l. 10. r. tells. p. 9. l. 11. r. Son. p. 16. l. 10. r. f.
l. 1. ch. p. 41. l. 10. r. inanimate. p. 50. Marg. r. 333. l. 14.
near Man, Rom. ch. p. 62. l. 17. r. so when it. p. 84. l. 15.
f. with. r. to p. 85. l. 11. r. ha. p. 89. l. 22. r. se vera pre-
sumunt. p. 114. l. 1. f. 29. r. 19. p. 115. l. 11. r. salutation.

certain standard Opinions, according to
the Method proposed by Dr. Clark for the
Satisfaction of itself.

This is then the Sum and Substance of
all that is contained in our Creed, Articles,
and Liturgy, relating to the Doctrine of

the Trinity, and I hope that
scilicet to be true. Will not that will
any other additional Explanations, which
are all reducible into this brief Summary.
And

And, if this be agreeable to the Doctrine
of Scripture (as I am fully persuaded it is)
then the Church hath delivered nothing con-
cerning this Doctrine in her Creed, Articles,
and Liturgy, but what may be proved by
most certain Warrants of Holy Scrip-
ture.

And the whole Consensus of the
Church, to this effect, that
the Father is God, the Son is God, and
the Holy Ghost is God, thus in Doctor
Clark and the Church.

Clark will readily grant, that the Church
affirms, as the Holy Ghost is one God; which
I look upon to be the same thing as to say,
that the Father is one God.

All that the Church teaches of us further,

Page 3. l. 10. r. tells. p. 9. l. 11. r. Son. p. 16. l. 10. r.
l. the. p. 41. l. 10. r. inanimate. p. 50. Marg. r. 333. l. 14.
near Man, Rom. ch. p. 62. l. 17. r. so when it. p. 84. l. 25.
f. with. r. to p. 85. l. 11. r. f. 2. p. 89. l. 22. r. se vera pre
sumat. p. 114. l. 1. f. 29. r. 19. p. 115. l. 12. r. saluati.

certain. These are Opinions, according to
the Method proposed by Dr. Clark for the
Supposition of Henry.

This is then the Sum and Substance of
all that is contained in our Creed, Articles,
and Liturgy, relating to the Doctrine of

F I N I S.

the Trinity, and I am fully persuaded
it is the same thing as to say, that the
Father is one God, the Son is one God,
and the Holy Ghost is one God, which
are all resolvable into this brief Summary:
And,

